

343

THE REFORMED QUARTERLY REVIEW

NO. 1.—JANUARY, 1893.

I. CALVIN AND SERVETUS.

BY PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D., LL.D.

THE burning of Servetus and the *decretum horribile* are sufficient in the judgment of a large part of the Christian world to condemn Calvin and his theology, but cannot destroy the rocky foundation of his rare virtues and lasting merits. History knows only of one sinless being,—the Saviour of sinners. Human greatness and purity are spotted by marks of infirmity, which forbid idolatry. Large bodies cast large shadows, and great virtues are often coupled with great vices.

Calvin and Servetus,—what a contrast! The best abused men of the sixteenth century, and yet direct antipodes of each other in spirit, doctrine and aim: the reformer and the deformer; the champion of orthodoxy and the archheretic; the master architect of construction and the master architect of ruin, brought together in deadly conflict for rule or ruin. Both were men of brilliant genius and learning; both deadly foes of the Roman Antichrist; both enthusiasts for a restoration of primitive Christianity, but with opposite views of what Christianity is.

They were of the same age, equally precocious, equally bold and independent, and relied on purely intellectual and spiritual forces. The one, while a youth of twenty-seven, wrote one of the best systems of theology and vindications of the Christian faith; the other, when scarcely above the age of twenty, ventured on the attempt to uproot the fundamental doctrine of orthodox Christendom. Both died in the prime of manhood,—the one a natural, the other a violent death.

Calvin's works are in every theological library; the books of Servetus are among the greatest rarities. Calvin left behind him flourishing churches, and his influence is felt to this day in the whole Protestant world; Servetus passed away like a meteor, without a sect, without a pupil; yet he still eloquently denounces from his funeral pile the crime and folly of religious persecution, and has recently been idealized by an orthodox Protestant divine as a prophetic forerunner of modern christo-centric theology.

Calvin felt himself called by Divine Providence to purify the Church of all corruptions, and to bring her back to the Christianity of Christ, and regarded Servetus as a servant of Antichrist, who aimed at the destruction of Christianity. Servetus was equally confident of a divine call, and even identified himself with the archangel Michael in his apocalyptic fight against the dragon of Rome and "the Simon Magus of Geneva."

A mysterious force of attraction and repulsion brought these intellectual giants together in the drama of the Reformation. Servetus, as if inspired by a demoniac force, urged himself upon the attention of Calvin, regarding him as the pope of orthodox Protestantism, whom he was determined to convert or to dethrone. He challenged Calvin in Paris to a disputation on the Trinity when the latter had scarcely left the Roman Church, but failed to appear at the appointed place and hour. He bombarded him with letters from Vienne; and at last he heedlessly rushed into his power at Geneva, and into the flames which have immortalized his name.

The judgment of historians on these remarkable men has

undergone a great change. Calvin's course in the tragedy of Servetus was fully approved by the best men in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. It is as fully condemned in the nineteenth century. Bishop Bossuet was able to affirm that all Christians were happily agreed in maintaining the rightfulness of the death penalty for obstinate heretics, as murderers of souls. A hundred years later the great historian Gibbon echoed the opposite public sentiment when he said: "I am more deeply scandalized at the single execution of Servetus than at the hecatombs which have blazed at auto-da-fés of Spain and Portugal."

It would be preposterous to compare Calvin with Torquemada. But it must be admitted that the burning of Servetus is a typical case of Protestant persecution, and makes Calvin responsible for a principle which may be made to justify an indefinite number of applications. Persecution deserves much severer condemnation in a Protestant than in a Roman Catholic, because it is inconsistent. Protestantism must stand or fall with freedom of conscience and freedom of worship.

From the standpoint of modern Christianity and civilization, the burning of Servetus admits of no justification. Even the most admiring biographers of Calvin lament and disapprove his conduct in this tragedy, which has spotted his fame and given to Servetus the glory of martyrdom.

But if we consider Calvin's course in the light of the sixteenth century, we must come to the conclusion that he acted his part from a strict sense of duty and in harmony with the public law and dominant sentiment of his age, which justified the death penalty for heresy and blasphemy, and abhorred toleration as involving indifference to truth. Even Servetus admitted the principle under which he suffered; for he said, that incorrigible obstinacy and malice deserved death before God and men.

Calvin's prominence for intolerance was his misfortune. It was an error of judgment, but not of the heart, and must be excused, though it cannot be justified, by the spirit of his age.

Calvin never changed his views or regretted his conduct towards Servetus. Nine years after his execution he justified it in self-defence against the reproaches of Baudouin (1562), saying: "Servetus suffered the penalty due to his heresies; but was it by my will? Certainly his arrogance destroyed him not less than his impiety. And what crime was it of mine if our Council, at my exhortation, indeed, but in conformity with the opinion of several churches, took vengeance on his execrable blasphemies? Let Baudouin abuse me as long as he will, provided that, by the judgment of Melancthon, posterity owes me a debt of gratitude for having purged the Church of so pernicious a monster."

In one respect he was in advance of his times, by recommending to the Council of Geneva, though in vain, a mitigation of punishment and the substitution of the sword for the stake.

Let us give him credit for this comparative moderation in a semi-barbarous age when not only hosts of heretics, but even innocent women, as witches, were cruelly tortured and roasted to death. Let us remember also that it was not simply a case of fundamental heresy, but of horrid blasphemy, with which he had to deal. If he was mistaken, if he misunderstood the real opinions of Servetus, that was an error of judgment, and an error which all the Catholics and Protestants of that age shared. Nor should it be overlooked that Servetus was convicted of falsehood, that he overwhelmed Calvin with abuse, and that he made common cause with the Libertines, the bitter enemies of Calvin, who had a controlling influence in the Council of Geneva at that time, and hoped to overthrow him.

It is objected that there was no law in Geneva to justify the punishment of Servetus, since the canon law had been abolished by the Reformation in 1535; but the Mosaic law was not abolished, it was even more strictly enforced; and it is from the Mosaic law against blasphemy that Calvin drew his chief argument.

On the other hand, however, we must frankly admit that

there were some aggravating circumstances which make it difficult to reconcile Calvin's conduct with the principles of justice and humanity. Seven years before the death of Servetus he had expressed his determination not to spare his life if he should come to Geneva. He wrote to Farel (Feb. 13, 1546): "Servetus lately wrote to me, and coupled with his letter a long volume of his delirious fancies, with the Thrasonic boast, that I should see something astonishing and unheard of. He offers to come hither if it be agreeable to me. But I am unwilling to pledge my word for his safety; for if he does come, and my authority be of any avail, I shall never suffer him to depart alive." It is not inconsistent with this design if he aided, as it would seem, in bringing the book of Servetus to the notice of the Roman inquisition in Lyons. He procured his arrest on his arrival in Geneva. He showed personal bitterness towards him during the trial. Servetus was a stranger in Geneva, and had committed no offence in that city. Calvin should have permitted him quietly to depart, or simply caused his expulsion from the territory of Geneva, as in the case of Bolsec. This would have been sufficient punishment. If he had recommended expulsion instead of decapitation, he would have saved himself the reproaches of posterity, which will never forget and never forgive the burning of Servetus.

In the interest of impartial history we must condemn the intolerance of the victor as well as the error of the victim, and admire in both the loyalty to conscientious conviction. Heresy is an error; intolerance, a sin; persecution, a crime.

THE EARLY LIFE OF SERVETUS.

We shall now present a short history of the life, trial and death of Servetus. For our knowledge of the origin and youth of Servetus we have to depend on the statements which he made at his trials before the Roman Catholic court at Vienne in April, 1553, and before the Calvinistic court at Geneva in August of the same year. These depositions are meagre and inconsistent, either from defect of memory or want of honesty.

In Geneva he could not deceive the judges, as Calvin was well acquainted with his antécédents. I give, therefore, the preference to his later testimony.

Michael Serveto, better known in the Latinized form Servetus, also called Reves, was born at Villa-neuva or Villanova in Aragon (hence "Villanovanus"), in 1509, the year of the nativity of Calvin, his great antagonist. He informed the court of Geneva that he was of an ancient and noble Spanish race, and that his father was a lawyer and notary by profession.

The hypothesis that he was of Jewish or Moorish extraction is an unwarranted inference from his knowledge of Hebrew and the Koran.

He was slender and delicate in body, but precocious, inquisitive, imaginative, acute, independent and inclined to mysticism and fanaticism. He seems to have received his early education in a Dominican convent and in the University of Saragossa, with a view at first to the clerical vocation.

He was sent by his father to the celebrated law-school of Toulouse, where he studied jurisprudence for two or three years. The University of Toulouse was strictly orthodox, and kept a close watch against the Lutheran heresy. But it was there that he first saw a complete copy of the Bible, as Luther did after he entered the University of Erfurt.

The Bible now became his guide. He fully adopted the Protestant principle of the supremacy and sufficiency of the Bible, but subjected it to his speculative fancy, and carried opposition to Catholic tradition much farther than the Reformers did. He rejected the œcumenical orthodoxy, while they rejected only the mediæval scholastic orthodoxy. It is characteristic of his mystical turn of mind that he made the Apocalypse the basis of his speculations, while the sober and judicious Calvin never commented on this book, of which it has been said that it either finds one crazy or leaves one crazy.

Servetus declared, in his first work, that the Bible was the source of all his philosophy and science, to be read a thousand

times. He called it a gift of God descended from heaven. Next to the Bible he esteemed the ante-Nicene Fathers, because of their simpler and less definite teaching. He quotes them freely in his first book.

We do not know whether, and how far, he was influenced by the writings of the Reformers. He may have read some tracts of Luther, which were early translated into Spanish, but he does not quote from them.

We next find Servetus in the employ of Juan Quintana, a Franciscan friar and confessor to the Emperor Charles V. He seems to have attended his court at the coronation by Pope Clement VII. in Bologna (1529), and on the journey to the Diet of Augsburg in 1530, which forms an epoch in the history of the Lutheran Reformation. At Augsburg he may have seen Melancthon and other leading Lutherans; but he was too young and unknown to attract much attention.

In the autumn of 1580 he was dismissed from the service of Quintana; we do not know for what reason, probably on suspicion of heresy.

We have no account of a conversion or moral struggle in any period of his life, such as the Reformers passed through. He never was a Protestant, either Lutheran or Reformed, but a radical at war with all orthodoxy. A mere youth of twenty-one or two, he boldly or imprudently struck out an independent path as a Reformer of the Reformation. The Socinian society did not yet exist; and even there he would not have felt at home, nor would he have long been tolerated. Nominally, he remained in the Roman Church, and felt no scruple about conforming to its rites. As he stood alone, so he died alone, leaving an influence, but no school nor sect.

From Germany Servetus went to Switzerland, and spent some time at Basel. There he first ventilated his heresies on the Trinity and the divinity of Christ.

He importuned Œcolampadius with interviews and letters, hoping to convert him. But Œcolampadius was startled and horrified. He informed his friends, Bucer, Zwingli and Bul-

linger, who happened to be at Basel in October, 1530, that he had been troubled of late by a hot-headed Spaniard, who denied the divine trinity and the eternal divinity of our Saviour. Zwingli advised him to try to convince Servetus of his error, and by good and wholesome arguments to win him over to the truth. Œcolampadius said that he could make no impression upon the haughty, daring and contentious man. Zwingli replied: "This is indeed a thing insufferable in the Church of God. Therefore do everything possible to prevent the spread of such dreadful blasphemy." Zwingli never saw the objectionable book in print.

Servetus sought to satisfy Œcolampadius by a misleading confession of faith; but the latter was not deceived by the explanations, and exhorted him to "confess the Son of God to be co-equal and co-eternal with the Father;" otherwise he could not acknowledge him as a Christian.

THE BOOK AGAINST THE HOLY TRINITY.

Servetus was too vain and obstinate to take advice. In the beginning of 1531 he secured a publisher for his book on the "Errors of the Trinity," Conrad Kœnig, who had two shops at Basel and Strassburg; sent the manuscript to Secerius, a printer at Hagenau in Alsace. Servetus went to that place to read the proof. He also visited Bucer and Capito at Strassburg, who received him with courtesy and kindness, and tried to convert him, but in vain.

In July, 1531, the book appeared under the name of the author, and was furnished to the trade at Strassburg, Frankfurt and Basel, but nobody knew where and by whom it was published. Suspicion fell upon Basel.

This book is a very original and, for so young a man, very remarkable treatise on the Trinity and Incarnation in opposition to the traditional and œcumenical faith. The style is crude and obscure, and not to be compared with Calvin's, who at the same age and in his earliest writings, showed himself a master of lucid, methodical and convincing statement in ele-

gant and forcible Latin. Servetus was familiar with the Bible, the ante-Nicene Fathers (Tertullian and Irenæus), and scholastic theology, and teemed with new, but ill-digested ideas, which he threw out like a firebrand. He afterwards embodied his first work in his last, but in revised shape.

It is not surprising that this book gave great offence to Catholics and Protestants alike, and appeared to them blasphemous. Servetus calls the Trinitarians tritheists and atheists, and their God a deception of the devil and a three-headed monster.

Cochlæus directed the attention of Quintana, at the Diet of Regensburg, in 1532, to the book of Servetus which was sold there, and Quintana at once took measures to suppress it. The Emperor prohibited it, and the book soon disappeared.

SERVETUS IN FRANCE.

As Servetus was repulsed by the Reformers of Switzerland and Germany, he left for France, and assumed the name of Michel de Villeneuve. His real name and his obnoxious books disappeared from the sight of the world till they emerged twenty years later at Vienne and at Geneva. He devoted himself to the study of mathematics, geography, astrology and medicine.

In 1534 he was in Paris, and challenged the young Calvin to a disputation, but failed to appear at the appointed hour.

He spent some time at Lyons as proof-reader and publisher of the famous printers, Melchior and Caspar Trechsel. He issued through them, in 1535, under the name of "Villanovanus," a magnificent edition of Ptolemy's Geography, with a self-laudatory preface, which concludes with the hope that "no one will underestimate the labor, though pleasant in itself, that is implied in the collation of our text with that of earlier editions, unless it be some Zoilus of contracted brow, who cannot look without envy upon the zealous labors of others." A second and improved edition appeared in 1541.

From Lyons he returned to Paris in 1536, and acquired

fame as a physician and lecturer in the university. He discovered the circulation of the blood.

In 1540 he settled at Vienne, in the south of France, as physician, under the patronage of Archbishop Palmier, his former pupil and admirer. He was not suspected of heresy, but lived on good terms with the Catholic authorities, and regularly attended mass.

“THE RESTITUTION OF CHRISTIANITY.”

During his sojourn at Vienna, Servetus prepared his chief theological work under the title, “The Restitution of Christianity.” He must have finished the greater part of it in manuscript as early as 1546, seven years before its publication in print; for in that year he sent a copy to Calvin, which he tried to get back to make some corrections, but Calvin had sent it to Viret at Lausanne, where it was detained. It was afterwards used at the trial and ordered by the Council of Geneva to be burnt at the stake, together with the printed volume.

The proud title indicates the pretentious and radical character of the book. It was chosen, probably, with reference to Calvin's “Institution of the Christian Religion.” In opposition to the great Reformer he claimed to be a Restorer. The Hebrew motto on the title-page was taken from Dan. 12: 1: “And at that time shall Michael stand up, the great prince;” the Greek motto from Rev. 12: 7: “And there was war in heaven,” which is followed by the words, “Michael and his angels going forth to war with the dragon; and the dragon warred, and his angels; and they prevailed not, neither was their place found any more in heaven. And the great dragon was cast down, the old serpent, he that is called the Devil and Satan, the deceiver of the whole world.”

The identity of the Christian name of the author with the name of the archangel is significant. Servetus fancied that the great battle with Antichrist was near at hand or had already begun, and that he was one of Michael's warriors, if not Michael himself.

His "Restitution of Christianity" was a manifesto of war. The woman in the twelfth chapter of Revelation he understood to be the true Church; her child, whom God saves, is the Christian faith; the great red dragon with seven heads and horns is the pope of Rome, the Antichrist predicted by Daniel, Paul and John. At the time of Constantine and the Council of Nicæa, which divided the one God into three parts, the Dragon began to drive the true Church into the wilderness, and retained his power for twelve hundred and sixty prophetic days or years; but now his reign is approaching to a close.

He was fully conscious of a divine mission to overthrow the tyranny, of the papal and Protestant Antichrist, and to restore Christianity to its primitive purity. "The task we have undertaken," he says in the preface, "is sublime in majesty, easy in perspicuity, and certain in demonstration; for it is no less than to make God known in His substantial manifestation by the Word and His divine communication by the Spirit, both comprised in Christ alone, through whom alone do we plainly discern how the deity of the Word and the Spirit may be apprehended in man. . . . We shall now see God, unseen before, with His face revealed, and behold Him shining in ourselves, if we open the door and enter in. It is high time to open this door and this way of the light, without which no one can read the sacred Scriptures, or know God, or become a Christian."

He forwarded the manuscript to a publisher in Basel, Marinus, who declined it in a letter, dated April 9, 1552, because it could not be safely published in that city at that time. He then made an arrangement with Balthasar Arnoullet, bookseller and publisher at Vienne, and Guillaume Guérout, his brother-in-law and manager of his printing establishment, who had run away from Geneva for bad conduct. He assured them that there were no errors in the book, and that, on the contrary, it was directed against the doctrines of Luther, Calvin, Melancthon and other heretics. He agreed to withhold his and their names and the name of the place of publication from the title-page. He assumed the whole of the expense of publication, and

paid them in advance the sum of one hundred gold dollars. No one in France knew at that time that his real name was Servetus, and that he was the author of the work, "On the Errors of the Trinity."

The "Restitution" was secretly printed in a small house away from the known establishment, within three or four months, and finished on the third of January, 1553. He corrected the proofs himself, but there are several typographical errors in it. The whole impression of one thousand copies were made up into bales of one hundred copies each; five bales were sent as white paper to Pierre Martin, type-founder of Lyons, to be forwarded by sea to Genoa and Venice; another lot to Jacob Bestet, bookseller at Chatillon; and a third to Frankfort. Calvin obtained one or more copies, probably from his friend Frellon of Lyons.

The first part of the "Restitution" is a revised and enlarged edition of the seven books "On the Errors of the Trinity." The seven books are condensed into five; and these are followed by two dialogues on the Trinity between Michael and Peter, which take the place of the sixth and seventh books of the older work. The other part of the "Restitution," which covers nearly two-thirds of the volume (pp. 287-734), is new, and embraces three books on Faith and the Righteousness of the Kingdom of Christ (287-354), four books on Regeneration and the Reign of Antichrist (355-576), thirty letters to Calvin (577-664), Sixty Signs of Antichrist (-664-670), and the Apology to Melancthon on the Mystery of the Trinity and on Ancient Discipline (671-734).

THE TRIAL AND CONDEMNATION OF SERVETUS AT VIENNE.

Shortly after the publication of the "Restitution" the fact was made known to the Roman Catholic authorities at Lyons through Guillaume Trie, a native of Lyons and a convert from Romanism, residing at that time in Geneva. He corresponded with a cousin at Lyons, by the name of Arneys, a zealous Romanist, who tried to reconvert him to his religion, and reproached the Church of Geneva with the want of discipline.

On the 26th of February, 1553, he wrote to Arneys that in Geneva vice and blasphemy were punished, while in France a dangerous heretic was tolerated, who deserved to be burned by Roman Catholics as well as Protestants, who blasphemed the holy Trinity, called Jesus Christ an idol, and the baptism of infants a diabolic invention. He gave his name as Michael Servetus, who called himself at present Villeneuve, a practicing physician at Vienne. In confirmation he sent the first leaf of the "Restitution," and named the printer Balthasar Arnoullet at Vienne.

This letter, and two others of Trie which followed, look very much as if they had been directed or inspired by Calvin. Servetus held him responsible. But Calvin denied the imputation as a calumny. At the same time he speaks rather lightly of it, and thinks that it would not have been dishonorable to denounce so dangerous a heretic to the proper authorities. He also frankly acknowledges that he caused his arrest at Geneva. He could see no material difference in principle between doing the same indirectly at Vienne and directly at Geneva. He simply denies that he was the originator of the papal trial and of the letter of Trie; but he does not deny that he furnished material for evidence, which was quite well known and publicly made use of in the trial where Servetus's letters to Calvin are mentioned as *pieces justificatives*. There can be no doubt that Trie, who describes himself as a comparatively unlettered man, got his information about Servetus and his book from Calvin, or his colleagues, either directly from conversation, or from pulpit denunciation. We must acquit Calvin of *direct* agency, but we cannot free him of indirect agency in this denunciation.

Calvin's indirect agency in the first, and his direct agency in the second arrest of Servetus admit of no proper justification, and are due to an excess of zeal for orthodoxy.

Arneys conveyed this information to the Roman Catholic authorities. The matter was brought to the knowledge of Cardinal Thurnon, at that time archbishop of Lyons, a cruel persecutor of the Protestants, and Matthias Ory, a regularly trained

inquisitor of the Roman see for the kingdom of France. They at once instituted judicial proceedings.

Villeneuve was summoned before the civil court of Vienne on the 16th of March. He kept the judges waiting two hours (during which he probably destroyed all suspicious papers), and appeared without any show of embarrassment. He affirmed that he had lived long at Vienne, in frequent company with ecclesiastics, without incurring any suspicion for heresy, and had always avoided all cause of offence. His apartments were searched, but nothing was found to incriminate him. On the following day the printing establishment of Arnoullet was searched with no better result. On the return of Arnoullet from a journey he was summoned before the tribunal, but he professed ignorance.

Inquisitor Ory now requested Arneys to secure additional proof from his cousin at Geneva. Trie forwarded on the 26th of March several autograph letters of Servetus which, he said, he had great difficulty in obtaining from Calvin (who ought to have absolutely refused). He added some pages from Calvin's *Institutes* with the marginal objections of Servetus to infant baptism in his handwriting. Ory, not yet satisfied, despatched a special messenger to Geneva to secure the manuscript of the *Restitutio*, and proof that Villeneuve was Servetus and Arnoullet his printer. Trie answered at once, on the last of March, that the manuscript of the *Restitutio* had been at Lausanne for a couple of years (with Viret), that Servetus had been banished from the churches of Germany (Basel and Strassburg) twenty-four years ago, and that Arnoullet and Guérout were his printers, as he knew from a good source which he would not mention (perhaps Frellon of Lyons).

The cardinal of Lyons and the archbishop of Vienne, after consultation with Inquisitor Ory and other ecclesiastics, now gave orders on the 4th of April for the arrest of Villeneuve and Arnoullet. They were confined in separate rooms in the Palais Delphinal. Villeneuve was allowed to keep a servant, and to see his friends. Ory was sent forth, hastened to Vienne, and arrived there the next morning.

After dinner Servetus, having been sworn on the Holy Gospels, was interrogated as to his name, age, and course of life. In his answers he told some palpable falsehoods to mislead the judges, and to prevent his being identified with Servetus, the heretic. He omitted to mention his residence in Toulouse, where he had been known under his real name, as the books of the University would show. He denied that he had written any other books than those on medicine and geography, although he had corrected many. On being shown some notes he had written on Calvin's *Institutes* about infant baptism, he acknowledged at last the authorship of the notes, but added that he must have written them inconsiderately for the purpose of discussion, and he submitted himself entirely to his holy Mother, the Church, from whose teachings he had never wished to differ.

At the second examination, on the sixth day of April, he was shown some of his epistles to Calvin. He declared, with tears in his eyes, that those letters were written when he was in Germany some twenty-five years ago, when there was printed in that country a book by a certain Servetus, a Spaniard, but from what part of Spain he did not know. At Paris he had heard Mons. Calvin spoken of as a learned man, and had entered into correspondence with him from curiosity, but begged him to keep his letters as confidential and as brotherly corrections. Calvin suspected, he continued, that I was Servetus, to which I replied, I was not Servetus, but would continue to personate Servetus in order to continue the discussion. Finally we fell out, got angry, abused each other, and broke off the correspondence about ten years ago. He protested before God and his judges that he had no intention to dogmatize or to teach anything against the Church or the Christian religion. He told similar lies when other letters were laid before him.

Servetus now resolved to escape, perhaps with the aid of some friends, after he had secured through his servant a debt of three hundred crowns from the Grand Prior of the monastery of St. Pierre. On the 7th of April, at four o'clock in the morning, he dressed himself, threw a night-gown over his clothes, and put

a velvet cap upon his head, and, pretending a call of nature, he secured from the unsuspecting jailer the key to the garden. He leaped from the roof of the outhouse and made his escape through the court and over the bridge across the Rhone. He carried with him his golden chain around his neck, valued at twenty crowns, six gold rings on his fingers, and plenty of money in his pockets.

Two hours elapsed before his escape became known. An alarm was given, the gates were closed, and the neighboring houses searched; but all in vain.

Nevertheless the prosecution went on. Sufficient evidence was found that the "Restitution" had been printed in Vienne; extracts were made from it to prove the heresies contained therein. The civil court, without waiting for the judgment of the spiritual tribunal (which was not given until six months afterwards), sentenced Servetus on the 17th of June, for heretical doctrines, for violation of the royal ordinances, and for escape from the royal prison, to pay a fine of one thousand *livres tournois* to the Dauphin, to be carried in a cart, together with his books, on a market-day through the principal streets to the place of execution, and to be burnt alive by a slow fire.

On the same day he was burnt in effigy, together with the five bales of his book, which had been consigned to Merrin at Lyons and brought back to Vienne.

The goods and chattels of the fugitive were seized and confiscated. The property he had acquired from his medical practice and literary labors amounted to four thousand crowns. The king bestowed them on the son of Monsieur d' Montgiron, lieutenant-general of Dauphiné and presiding judge of the court.

Arnoullet was discharged on proving that he had been deceived by Guérout, who seems to have escaped by flight. He took care that the remaining copies of the heretical book in France should be destroyed. Stephens, the famous publisher, who had come to Geneva in 1552, sacrificed the copies in his hands. Those that had been sent to Frankford were burnt at the instance of Calvin.

On the 28d of December, two months after the execution of Servetus, the ecclesiastical tribunal of Vienne pronounced a sentence of condemnation on him.

SERVETUS FLEES TO GENEVA AND IS ARRESTED.

Escaped from one danger of death, Servetus, as by "a fatal madness," as Calvin says, rushed into another. Did he aspire to the glory of martyrdom in Geneva, as he seemed to intimate in his letter to Poupin? But he had just escaped martyrdom in France. Or did he wish to have a personal interview with Calvin, which he had sought in Paris in 1534, and again in Vienne in 1546? But after publishing his abusive letters and suspecting him for denunciation, he could hardly entertain such a wish. Or did he merely intend to pass through the place on his way to Italy? But in this case he need not tarry there for weeks, and he might have taken another route through Savoy, or by the sea. Or did he hope to dethrone "the pope of Geneva" with the aid of his enemies, who had just then the political control of the Republic?

He lingered in France for about three months. He intended, first, as he declared at the trial, to proceed to Spain, but finding the journey unsafe, he turned his eye to Naples, where he hoped to make a living as physician among the numerous Spanish residents. This he could easily have done under a new name.

He took his way through Geneva. He arrived there after the middle of July, 1553, alone and on foot, having left his horse on the French border. He took up his lodging in the Auberge de la Rose, a small inn on the banks of the lake. His dress and manner, his gold chain and gold rings, excited attention. On being asked by his host whether he was married, he answered, like a light-hearted cavalier, that women enough could be found without marrying? This frivolous reply provoked suspicion of immorality, and was made use of at the trial, but unjustly, for a fracture disabled him for marriage and prevented libertinage.

He remained about a month, and then intended to leave for Zürich. He asked his host to hire a boat to convey him over the lake some distance eastward.

But before his departure he attended church, on Sunday, the 18th of August. He was recognized and arrested by an officer of the police in the name of the Council.

Calvin was responsible for his arrest, as he frankly and repeatedly acknowledged. It was a fatal mistake. Servetus was a stranger and had committed no offence in Geneva. Calvin ought to have allowed him quietly to proceed on his intended journey. Why then did he act otherwise? Certainly not from personal malice, nor other selfish reasons; for he only increased the difficulty of his critical situation, and run the risk of his defeat by the Libertine party then in power. It was an error of judgment. He was under the false impression that Servetus had just come from Venice, the headquarters of Italian humanists and skeptics, to propagate his errors in Geneva, and he considered it his duty to make so dangerous a man harmless, by bringing him either to conviction and recantation, or to deserved punishment. He was determined to stand or fall with the principle of purity of doctrine and discipline. Rilliet justifies the arrest as a necessary measure of self-defence. "Under pain of abdication," he says, "Calvin must do everything rather than suffer by his side in Geneva a man whom he considered the greatest enemy of the Reformation; and the critical position in which he saw it in the bosom of the Republic, was one motive more to remove, if it was possible, the new element of dissolution which the free sojourn of Servetus would have created. . . . To tolerate Servetus with impunity at Geneva would have been for Calvin to exile himself. . . . He had no alternative. The man whom a Calvinist accusation had caused to be arrested, tried, and condemned to the flames in France, could not find an asylum in the city from which that accusation had issued."

STATE OF POLITICAL PARTIES AT GENEVA IN 1553.

Calvin's position in Geneva at that time was very critical. For in the year 1553 he was in the fever-heat of the struggle for church discipline with the Patriots and Libertines, who had gained a temporary ascendancy in the government. Amy Perrin, the leader of the patriotic party, was then captain-general and chief syndic, and several of his kinsmen and friends were members of the Little Council of Twenty-five. During the trial of Servetus the Council sustained Philibert Berthelier, against the act of excommunication by the Consistory, and took church discipline into its own hands. The foreign refugees were made harmless by being deprived of their arms. Violence was threatened to the Reformer. He was everywhere saluted as "a heretic," and insulted on the streets. Beza says: "In the year 1553, the wickedness of the seditious, hastening to a close, was so turbulent that both Church and State were brought into extreme danger. . . . Everything seemed to be in a state of preparation for accomplishing the plans of the seditious, since all was subject to their power." And Calvin, at the close of that year, wrote to a friend: "For four years the factions have done all to lead by degrees to the overthrow of this Church, already very weak. . . . Behold two years of our life have passed as if we lived among the avowed enemies of the gospel."

The hostility of the Council to Calvin and his discipline continued even after the execution of Servetus for nearly two more years. He asked the assistance of Bullinger and the Church of Zurich to come to his aid again in this struggle. He wrote to Ambrose Blaurer, February 6, 1554: "These last few years evil disposed persons have not ceased on every occasion to create for us new subjects of vexation. At length in their endeavors to render null our excommunication, there is no excess of folly they have left unattempted. Everywhere the contest was long maintained with much violence, because in the senate and among the people the passions of the contending

parties had been so much inflamed that there was some risk of a tumult."

We do not know whether Servetus was aware of this state of things. But he could not have come at a time more favorable to him and more unfavorable to Calvin. Among the Libertines and Patriots, who hated the yoke of Calvin even more than the yoke of the pope, Servetus found natural supporters who, in turn, would gladly use him for political purposes. This fact emboldened him to take such a defiant attitude in the trial and to overwhelm Calvin with abuse.

The final responsibility of the condemnation, therefore, rests with the Council of Geneva, which would probably have acted otherwise, if it had not been strongly influenced by the judgment of the Swiss Churches and the government of Bern. Calvin conducted the theological part of the examination of the trial, but had no direct influence upon the result. His theory was that the Church must convict and denounce the heretic theologically, but that his condemnation and punishment is the exclusive function of the State, and that it is one of its most sacred duties to punish attacks made on the Divine majesty.

"From the time Servetus was convicted of his heresy," says Calvin, "I have not uttered a word about his punishment, as all honest men will bear witness; and I challenge even the malignant to deny it if they can." One thing only he did: he expressed the wish for a mitigation of his punishment. And this humane sentiment is almost the only good thing that can be recorded to his honor in this painful trial.

THE FIRST ACT OF THE TRIAL AT GENEVA.

Servetus was confined near the Church of St. Pierre, in the ancient residence of the bishops of Geneva, which had been turned into a prison. His personal property consisted of ninety-seven crowns, a chain of gold weighing about twenty crowns, and six gold rings (a large turquoise, a white sapphire, a diamond, a ruby, a large emerald of Peru, and a signet ring of

coralline). These valuables were surrendered to Pierre Tissot, and after the process given to the hospital. The prisoner was allowed to have paper and ink, and such books as could be procured at Geneva or Lyons at his own expense. Calvin lent him Ignatius, Polycarp, Tertullian, and Irenæus. But he was denied the benefit of counsel, according to the ordinances of 1543. This is contrary to the law of equity and is one of the worst features of the trial.

The laws of Geneva demanded that the accuser should become a prisoner with the accused, in order that in the event of the charge proving false, the former might undergo punishment in the place of the accused. The person employed for this purpose was Nicolas de la Fontaine, a Frenchman, a theological student, and Calvin's private secretary. The accused as well as the accuser were foreigners. Another law obliged the Little Council to examine every prisoner within twenty-four hours after his arrest. The advocate or "Speaker" of Nicolas de la Fontaine in the trial was Germain Colladon, likewise a Frenchman and an able lawyer, who had fled for his religion, and aided Calvin in framing a new constitution for Geneva.

The trial began on the 15th of August and continued, with interruptions for more than two months. It was conducted in French and took place in the Bishop's Palace, according to the forms prescribed by law, in the presence of the Little Council, the herald of the city, the Lord-Lieutenant, and several citizens, who had a right to sit in criminal processes, but did not take part in the judgment. Among these was Berthelier, the bitter enemy of Calvin.

Servetus answered the preliminary questions as to his name, age, and previous history more truthfully than he had done before the Catholic tribunal, and incidentally accused Calvin of having caused the prosecution at Vienne. It is not owing to Calvin, he said, that he was not burnt alive there.

The deed of accusation, as lodged by Nicolas de la Fontaine, consisted of thirty-eight articles which were drawn up by Calvin (as he himself informs us), and were fortified by references to

the books of Servetus, which were produced in evidence, especially the "Restitution of Christianity," both the manuscript copy, which Servetus had sent to Calvin in advance, and a printed copy.

The principal charges were, that he had published heretical opinions and blasphemies concerning the Trinity, the person of Christ, and infant baptism. He gave evasive or orthodox-sounding answers. He confessed to believe in the trinity of persons, but understood the word "person" in a different sense from that used by modern writers, and appealed to the first teachers of the Church and the disciples of the apostles. He denied at first that he had called the Trinity three devils and Cerberus; but he had done so repeatedly and confessed it afterwards. He professed to believe that Jesus Christ was the Son of God according to His divinity and humanity; that the flesh of Christ came from heaven and of the substance of God; but as to the matter it came from the Virgin Mary. He denied the view imputed to him that the soul was mortal. He admitted that he had called infant baptism "a diabolical invention and infernal falsehood destructive of Christianity." This was a dangerous admission; for the Anabaptists were suspected of seditious and revolutionary opinions.

He was also charged with having, "in the person of M. Calvin, defamed the doctrines of the gospel and of the Church of Geneva." To this he replied that in what he had formerly written against Calvin, in his own defence, he had not intended to injure him, but to show him his errors and faults, which he was ready to prove by Scripture and good reasons before a full congregation.

This was a bold challenge. Calvin was willing to accept it, but the Council declined, fearing to lose the control of the affair by submitting it to the tribunal of public opinion. The friends of Servetus would have run the risk of seeing him defeated in public debate. That charge, however, which seemed to betray personal ill-feeling of Calvin, was afterwards very properly omitted.

On the following day, the 16th of August, Berthelier, then smarting under the sentence of excommunication by the Consistory, openly came to the defence of Servetus, and had a stormy encounter with Colladon, which is omitted in the official record, but indicated by blanks and the abrupt termination: "Here they proceeded no further, but adjourned till to-morrow at mid-day."

On Thursday, the 17th of August, Calvin himself appeared before the Council as the real accuser, and again on the 21st of August. He also conferred with his antagonist in writing. Servetus was not a match for Calvin either in learning or argument; but he showed great skill and some force.

He contemptuously repelled the frivolous charge that, in his Ptolemy, he had contradicted the authority of Moses, by describing Palestine as an unfruitful country (which it was then, and is now). He wiped his mouth and said, "Let us go on; there is nothing wrong there."

The charge of having, in his notes on the Latin Bible, explained the servant of God in the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah, as meaning King Cyrus, instead of the Saviour, he disposed of by distinguishing two senses of prophecy—the literal and historical sense which referred to Cyrus, and the mystical and principal sense which referred to Christ. He quoted Nicolaus de Lyra; but Calvin showed him the error, and asserts that he audaciously quoted books which he had never examined.

As to his calling the Trinity "a Cerberus" and "a dream of Augustin," and the Trinitarians "atheists," he said that he did not mean the true Trinity, which he believed himself, but the false trinity of his opponents; and that the oldest teachers before the Council of Nicæa did not teach that trinity, and did not use the word. Among them he quoted Ignatius, Polycarp, Clement of Rome, Irenæus, Tertullian, and Clement of Alexandria. Calvin refuted his assertion by quotations from Justin Martyr, Tertullian, and Origen. On this occasion he charges him, unjustly, with total ignorance of Greek, because he was

embarrassed by a Greek quotation from Justin Martyr, and called for a Latin version.

In discussing the relation of the divine substance to that of the creatures, Servetus declared that "all creatures are of the substance of God, and that God is in all things." Calvin asked him "How, unhappy man, if any one strike the pavement with his foot and say that he tramples on thy God, wouldst thou not be horrified at having the Majesty of heaven subjected to such indignity?" To this Servetus replied: "I have no doubt that this bench, and this buffet, and all you can show me, are of the substance of God." When it was objected that in his view God must be substantially even in the devil, he burst out into a laugh, and rejoined: "Can you doubt this? I hold this for a general maxim, that all things are part and parcel of God, and that the nature of things is his substantial Spirit."

The result of this first act of the trial was unfavorable to the prisoner, but not decisive.

Calvin used the freedom of the pulpit to counteract the efforts of the Libertine party in favor of Servetus.

THE SECOND ACT OF THE TRIAL AT GENEVA.

The original prosecution being discharged, the case was handed over to the attorney-general, Claude Rigot, in compliance with the criminal ordinance of 1543. Thus the second act of the trial began. The prisoner was examined again, and a new indictment of thirty articles was prepared, which bore less on the actual heresies of the accused than on their dangerous practical tendency and his persistency in spreading them.

The Council wrote also to the judges of Vienne to procure particulars of the charges which had been brought against him there.

Servetus defended himself before the Council on the 23d of August, with ingenuity and apparent frankness against the new charges of quarrelsomeness and immorality. As to the latter, he pleaded his physical infirmity which protected him against the temptation of licentiousness. He had always studied the

Scripture and tried to lead a Christian life. He did not think that his book would disturb the peace of Christendom, but would promote the truth. He denied that he had come to Geneva for any sinister purpose; he merely wished to pass through on his way to Zürich and Naples.

At the same time he prepared a written petition to the Council, which was received on the 24th of August. He demanded his release from the criminal charge for several reasons, which ought to have had considerable weight: that it was unknown in the Christian Church before the time of Constantine to try cases of heresy before a civil tribunal; that he had not offended against the laws either in Geneva or elsewhere; that he was not seditious nor turbulent; that his books treated of abstruse questions, and were addressed to the learned; that he had not spoken of these subjects to anybody but *Ecclampadius*, *Bucer*, and *Capito*; that he had ever refuted the Anabaptists, who rebelled against the magistrates and wished to have all things in common. In case he was not released, he demanded the aid of an advocate acquainted with the laws and customs of the country. Certainly a very reasonable request.

The attorney-general prepared a second indictment in refutation of the arguments of Servetus, who had studied law at Toulouse. He showed that the first Christian emperors claimed for themselves the cognizance and trial of heresies, and that their laws and constitutions condemned antitrinitarian heretics and blasphemers to death. He charged him with falsehood in declaring that he had written against the Anabaptists, and that he had not communicated his doctrine to any person during the last thirty years. The counsel asked for was refused because it was forbidden by the criminal statutes (1543), and because there was "not one jot of apparent innocence which requires an attorney." The very thing to be proved!

A new examination followed which elicited some points of interest. Servetus stated his belief that the Reformation would progress much further than Luther and Calvin intended, and that new things were always first rejected, but afterwards received.

To the absurd charge of making use of the Koran, he replied that he had quoted it for the glory of Christ, that the Koran abounds in what is good, and that even in a wicked book one might find some good things.

On the last day of August the Little Council received answer from Vienne. The commandant of the royal palace in that city arrived in Geneva, communicated to them a copy of the sentence of death pronounced against Villeneuve, and begged them to send him back to France that the sentence might be executed on the living man as it had been already executed on his effigy and books. The Council refused to surrender Servetus, in accordance with analogous cases, but promised to do full justice. The prisoner himself, who could see only a burning funeral pile for him in Vienne, preferred to be tried in Geneva, where he had some chance of acquittal or lighter punishment. He incidentally justified his habit of attending mass at Vienne by the example of Paul, who went to the temple, like the Jews; yet he confessed that in doing so he had sinned through fear of death.

The communication from Vienne had probably the influence of stimulating the zeal of the Council for orthodoxy. They wished not to be behind the Roman Church in that respect. But the issue was still uncertain.

The Council again confronted Servetus with Calvin on the first day of September. On the same day it granted, in spite of the strong protest of Calvin, permission to Philibert Berthelier to approach the communion table. It thus annulled the act of excommunication by the Consistory, and arrogated to itself the power of ecclesiastical discipline.

A few hours afterwards the investigation was resumed in the prison. Perrin and Berthelier were present as judges, and came to the aid of Servetus in the oral debate with Calvin, but, it seems, without success; for they resorted to a written discussion in which Servetus could better defend himself, and in which Calvin might complicate his already critical position. They wished, moreover, to refer the affair to the churches of Switzerland, which, in the case of Bolsec, had shown themselves much

more tolerant than Calvin. Servetus demanded such reference. Calvin did not like it, but did not openly oppose it.

The Council, without entering on the discussion, decided that Calvin should extract in Latin, from the books of Servetus, the objectionable articles, word for word, contained therein; that Servetus should write his answers and vindications, also in Latin; that Calvin should in his turn furnish his replies; and that these documents be forwarded to the Swiss Churches as a basis of judgment. All this was fair and impartial.

On the same day Calvin extracted thirty-eight propositions from the books of Servetus with references, but without comments.

Then, turning with astonishing energy from one enemy to the other, he appeared before the Little Council on the 2d of September to protest most earnestly against their protection of Berthelier, who intended to present himself on the following day as a guest at the Lord's table, and by the strength of the civil power to force Calvin to give him the tokens of the body and blood of Christ. He declared before the Council that he would rather die than act against his conscience. The Council did not yield, but resolved secretly to advise Berthelier to abstain from receiving the sacrament for the present. Calvin, ignorant of this secret advice, and resolved to conquer or to die, thundered from the pulpit of St. Peter on the 3d of September his determination to refuse, at the risk of his life, the sacred elements to an excommunicated person. Berthelier did not dare to approach the table. Calvin had achieved a moral victory over the Council.

In the mean time Servetus had, within the space of twenty-four hours, prepared a written defence, as directed by the Council, against the thirty-eight articles of Calvin. It was both apologetic and boldly aggressive, clear, keen, violent and bitter. He contemptuously repelled Calvin's interference in the trial, and charged him with presumption in framing articles of faith after the fashion of the doctors of the Sorbonne, without Scripture proof. He affirmed that he either misunderstood him or

craftily perverted his meaning. He quotes from Tertullian, Irenæus, and pseudo-Clement in support of his views. He calls him a disciple of Simon Magus, a criminal accuser, and a homicide. He ridiculed the idea that such a man should call himself an orthodox minister of the Church.

Calvin replied within two days in a document of twenty-three folio pages, which were signed by all the fourteen ministers of Geneva. He meets the patristic quotations of Servetus with counter-quotations, with Scripture passages and solid arguments, and charged him in conclusion with the intention "to subvert all religion."

These three documents, which contained the essence of the doctrinal discussion, were presented to the Little Council on Tuesday, the 5th of September.

On the 15th of September Servetus addressed a petition to the Council in which he attacked Calvin as his persecutor, complained of his miserable condition in prison and want of the necessary clothing, and demanded an advocate and the transfer of his trial to the Large Council of Two Hundred, where he had reason to expect a majority in his favor. This course had probably been suggested to him (as Rilliet conjectures) by Perrin and Berthelier through the jailer, Claude de Genève, who was a member of the Libertine party.

On the same day the Little Council ordered an improvement of the prisoner's wardrobe (which, however, was delayed by culpable neglect), and sent him the three documents, with permission to make a last reply to Calvin, but took no action on his appeal to the Large Council, having no disposition to renounce its own authority.

Servetus at once prepared a reply by the way of explanatory annotations, on the margin and between the lines of the memorial of Calvin and the ministers. These annotations are full of the coarsest abuse, and read like the productions of a madman. He calls Calvin again and again a liar, an impostor, a miserable wretch (*nebulo pessimus*), a hypocrite, a disciple of Simon Magus, etc. Take these specimens: "Do you deny that you are a man-

slayer? I will prove it by your acts. You dare not deny that you are Simon Magus. As for me, I am firm in so good a cause, and do not fear death. . . . You deal with sophistical arguments without Scripture. . . . You do not understand what you say. You howl like a blind man in the desert. . . . You lie, you lie, you lie, you ignorant calumniator. . . . Madness is in you when you persecute to death. . . . I wish that all your magic were still in the belly of your mother. . . . I wish I were free to make a catalogue of your errors. Whoever is not a Simon Magus is considered a Pelagian by Calvin. All, therefore, who have been in Christendom are damned by Calvin; even the apostles, their disciples, the ancient doctors of the Church and all the rest. For no one ever entirely abolished free-will except that Simon Magus. Thou liest, thou liest, thou liest, thou liest, thou miserable wretch."

He concludes with the remark that "his doctrine was met merely by clamors, not by argument or any authority," and he subscribed his name as one who had Christ for his certain protector.

He sent these notes to the Council on the 18th of September. It was shown to Calvin, but he did not deem it expedient to make a reply. Silence in this case was better than speech.

The debate, therefore, between the two divines was closed, and the trial became an affair of Protestant Switzerland, which should act as a jury.

CONSULTATION OF THE SWISS CHURCHES. THE DEFIANT ATTITUDE OF SERVETUS.

On the 19th of September the Little Council, in accordance with a resolution adopted on the 4th, referred the case of Servetus to the magistrates and pastors of the Reformed Churches of Bern, Zürich, Schaffhausen, and Basel for their judgment.

Two days afterwards Jaquemox Jernoz, as the official messenger, was despatched on his mission with a circular letter and the documents,—namely the theological debate between Calvin and Servetus,—a copy of the "Restitution of Christianity,"

and the works of Tertullian and Irenæus, who were the chief patristic authorities quoted by both parties.

On the result of this mission the case of Servetus was made to depend. Servetus himself had expressed a wish that this course should be adopted, hoping, it seems, to gain a victory, or at least an escape from capital punishment. On the 22d of August he was willing to be banished from Geneva; but on the 22d of September he asked the Council to put Calvin on trial, and handed in a list of articles on which he should be interrogated. He thus admitted the civil jurisdiction in matters of religious opinions which he had formerly denied, and was willing to stake his life on the decision, provided that his antagonist should be exposed to the same fate. Among the four "great and infallible" reasons why Calvin should be condemned, he assigned the fact that he wished to "repress the truth of Jesus Christ, and follow the doctrines of Simon Magus, against all the doctors that ever were in the Church." He declared in his petition that Calvin, like a magician, ought to be exterminated, and his goods be confiscated and given to him in compensation for the loss he (Servetus) had sustained through his accuser. "To dislodge Calvin from his position," says Rilliet, "to expel him from Geneva, to satisfy a just vengeance—these were the objects toward which Servetus rushed."

But the Council took no notice of his petition.

On the 10th of October he sent another letter to the Council, imploring them, for the love of Christ, to grant him such justice as they would not refuse to a Turk, and complaining that nothing had been done for his comfort as promised, but that he was more wretched than ever. The petition had some effect. The Lord Syndic, Darlod, and the Secretary of State, Claude Roset, were directed to visit his prison and to provide some articles of dress for his relief.

On the 18th of October the messenger of the State returned with the answers from the four foreign churches. They were forthwith translated into French, and examined by the magistrates. The Swiss Reformers and churches were unanimous

in condemning the theological doctrines of Servetus, and in the testimony of respect and affection for Calvin and his colleagues. Even Bern, which was not on good terms with Calvin, and had two years earlier counselled toleration in the case of Bolsec, regarded Servetus a much more dangerous heretic and advised to remove this "pest." Yet none of the churches consulted, expressly suggested the death penalty, and left the mode of punishment with the discretion of a sovereign State. Haller, the pastor of Bern, however, wrote to Bullinger of Zürich that if Servetus had fallen into the hands of Bernese justice, he would undoubtedly have been condemned to the flames.

CONDEMNATION OF SERVETUS.

On the 23d of October the Council met for a careful examination of the replies of the churches, but could not come to a decision on account of the absence of several members, especially Perrin, the Chief Syndic, who feigned sickness. Servetus had failed to excite any sympathy among the people, and had injured his cause by his obstinate and defiant conduct. The Libertines, who wished to use him as a tool for political purposes, were discouraged and intimidated by the council of Bern, to which they looked for protection against the hated régime of Calvin.

The full session of the Council on the 26th, to which all counsellors were summoned on the faith of their oath, decided the fate of the unfortunate prisoner, but not without a stormy discussion. Amy Perrin presided and made a last effort in favor of Servetus. He at first insisted upon his acquittal, which would have been equivalent to the exile of Calvin and a permanent triumph of the party opposed to him. Being baffled, he proposed, as another alternative, that Servetus, in accordance with his own wishes, be transferred to the Council of the Two Hundred. But this proposal was also rejected. He was influenced by political passion rather than by sympathy with heresy or love of toleration, which had very few advocates at that time. When he perceived that the majority of the Council

was inclined to a sentence of death, he quitted the senate house with a few others. The Council had no doubt of its jurisdiction in the case; it had to respect the unanimous judgment of the churches, the public horror of heresy and blasphemy, and the imperial laws of Christendom, which were appealed to by the attorney-general. The decision was unanimous. Even the wish of Calvin to substitute the sword for the fire was overruled, and the papal practice of the *auto-da-fé* followed, though without the solemn mockery of a religious festival.

The judges, after enumerating the crimes of Servetus, in calling the holy Trinity a monster with three heads, blaspheming the Son of God, denying infant-baptism as an invention of the devil and of witchcraft, assailing the Christian faith, and after mentioning that he had been condemned and burned in effigy at Vienne, and had during his residence in Geneva persisted in his vile and detestable errors, and called all true Christians tri-theists, atheists, sorcerers, putting aside all remonstrances and corrections with a malicious and perverse obstinacy, pronounced the fearful sentence:

"We condemn thee, Michael Servetus, to be bound, and led to the place of Champel, there to be fastened to a stake and burnt alive, together with thy book, as well the one written by thy hand as the printed one, even till thy body be reduced to ashes; and thus shalt thou finish thy days to furnish an example to others who might wish to commit the like.

"And we command our Lieutenant to see that this our present sentence be executed."

Rilliet, who published the official report of the trial in the interest of history, without special sympathy with Calvin, says that the sentence of condemnation was odious before our consciences, but just according to the law. Let us thank God that these unchristian and barbarous laws are abolished forever.

Calvin communicated to Farel on the 26th of October a brief summary of the result, in which he says: "The messenger has returned from the Swiss Churches. They are unanimous in pronouncing that Servetus has now renewed those impious errors with which Satan formerly disturbed the Church, and that he is a monster not to be borne. Those of

Basel are judicious. The Zürichers are the most vehement of all. . . . They of Schaffhausen will agree. To an appropriate letter from the Bernese is added one from the Senate in which they stimulate ours not a little. Cæsar, the comedian [so he sarcastically called Perrin], after feigning illness for three days, at length went up to the assembly in order to free that wretch [Servetus] from punishment. Nor was he ashamed to ask that inquiry might be made at the Council of the Two Hundred. However, Servetus was without dissent condemned. He will be led forth to punishment to-morrow. We endeavored to alter the mode of his death, but in vain. Why we did not succeed, I defer my narration until I see you."

This letter reached Farel on his way to Geneva, where he arrived on the same day, in time to hear the sentence of condemnation. He had come at the request of Calvin, to perform the last pastoral duties to the prisoner, which could not so well be done by any of the pastors of Geneva.

EXECUTION OF SERVETUS, OCT. 27, 1553.

When Servetus on the following morning heard of the unexpected sentence of death, he was horror-struck and behaved like a madman. He uttered groans, and cried aloud in Spanish, "Mercy, mercy!"

The venerable old Farel visited him in the prison at seven in the morning, and remained with him till the hour of his death. He tried to convince him of his error. Servetus asked him to quote a single Scripture passage where Christ was called "Son of God" *before* his incarnation. Farel could not satisfy him. He brought about an interview with Calvin, of which the latter gives us an account. Servetus, proud as he was, humbly asked his pardon. Calvin protested that he had never pursued any personal quarrel against him. "Sixteen years ago," he said, "I spared no pains at Paris to gain you to our Lord. You then shunned the light. I did not cease to exhort you by letters, but all in vain. You have heaped upon me I know not how much fury rather than anger. But as to

the rest, I pass by what concerns myself. Think rather of crying for mercy to God whom you have blasphemed." This address had no more effect than the exhortation of Farel, and Calvin left the room in obedience, as he says, to St. Paul's order (Tit. 3: 10, 11), to withdraw from a self-condemned heretic. Servetus appeared as mild and humble as he had been bold and arrogant, but did not change his conviction.

At eleven o'clock on the 27th of October, Servetus was led from the prison to the gates of the City Hall, to hear the sentence read from the balcony by the Lord Syndic Darlod. When he heard the last words, he fell on his knees and exclaimed: "The sword! in mercy! and not fire! Or I may lose my soul in despair." He protested that if he had sinned, it was through ignorance. Farel raised him up and said: "Confess thy crime, and God will have mercy on your soul." Servetus replied: "I am not guilty; I have not merited death." Then he smote his breast, invoked God for pardon, confessed Christ as his Saviour, and besought God to pardon his accusers.

On the short journey to the place of execution, Farel again attempted to obtain a confession, but Servetus was silent. He showed the courage and consistency of a martyr in these last awful moments.

Châmpel is a little hill south of Geneva with a fine view on one of the loveliest paradises of nature. There was prepared a funeral pile hidden in part by the autumnal leaves of the oak trees. The Lord Lieutenant and the herald on horseback, both arrayed in the insignia of their office, arrive with the doomed man and the old pastor, followed by a small procession of spectators. Farel invites Servetus to solicit the prayers of the people and to unite his prayers with theirs. Servetus obeys in silence. The executioner fastens him by iron chains to the stake amidst the fagots, puts a crown of leaves covered with sulphur on his head, and binds his book by his side. The sight of the flaming torch extorts from him a piercing shriek of "*misericordias*" in his native tongue. The spectators fall back with a shudder. The flames soon reach him and consume his mortal frame in

the forty-fourth year of his fitful life. In the last moment he is heard to pray, in smoke and agony, with a loud voice: "Jesus Christ, thou Son of the eternal God, have mercy upon me!"

This was at once a confession of his faith and of his error. He could not be induced, says Farel, to confess that Christ was the eternal Son of God.

The tragedy ended when the clock of St. Peter's struck twelve. The people quietly dispersed to their homes. Farel returned at once to Neuchâtel, even without calling on Calvin. The subject was too painful to be discussed.

The conscience and piety of that age approved of the execution, and left little room for the emotions of compassion. But two hundred years afterwards a distinguished scholar and minister of Geneva echoed the sentiments of his fellow-citizens when he said: "Would to God that we could extinguish this funeral pile with our tears." Dr. Henry, the admiring biographer of Calvin, imagines an impartial Christian jury of the nineteenth century assembled on Champel, which would pronounce the judgment of Calvin "Not guilty"; on Servetus, "Guilty, with extenuating circumstances."

The flames of Champel have consumed the intolerance of Calvin as well as the heresy of Servetus.

THE CHARACTER OF SERVETUS.

Servetus—theologian, philosopher, geographer, physician, scientist, and astrologer—was one of the most remarkable men in the history of heresy. He was of medium size, thin and pale, like Calvin, his eyes beaming with intelligence, and an expression of melancholy and fanaticism. Owing to a physical rupture he was never married. He seems never to have had any particular friends, and stood isolated and alone.

His mental endowments and acquirements were of a high order, and placed him far above the heretics of his age and almost on an equality with the Reformers. His discoveries have immortalized his name in the history of science. He

knew Latin, Hebrew and Greek (though Calvin depreciates his knowledge of Greek), as well as Spanish, French, and Italian, and was well read in the Bible, the early fathers, and schoolmen. He had an original, speculative, and acute mind, a tenacious memory, ready wit, a fiery imagination, ardent love of learning, and untiring industry. He anticipated the leading doctrines of Socinianism and Unitarianism, but in connection with mystic and pantheistic speculations, which his contemporaries did not understand. He had much uncommon sense, but little practical common sense. He lacked balance and soundness. There was a streak of fanaticism in his brain. His eccentric genius bordered closely on the line of insanity. For

"Great wits are sure to madness near allied,
And thin partitions do their bounds divide."

His style is frequently obscure, inelegant, abrupt, diffuse and repetitious. He accumulates arguments to an extent that destroys their effect. He gives eight arguments to prove that the saints in heaven pray for us; ten arguments to show that Melancthon and his friends were sorcerers, blinded by the devil; twenty arguments against infant baptism; twenty-five reasons for the necessity of faith before baptism; and sixty signs of the apocalyptic beast and the reign of Antichrist.

In thought and style he was the opposite of the clear-headed, well-balanced, methodical, logical, and thoroughly sound Calvin, who never leaves the reader in doubt as to his meaning.

The moral character of Servetus was free from immorality of which his enemies at first suspected him in the common opinion of the close connection of heresy with vice. But he was vain, proud, defiant, quarrelsome, revengeful, irreverent in the use of language, deceitful, and mendacious. He abused popery and the Reformers with unreasonable violence. He conformed for years to the Catholic ritual which he despised as idolatrous. He defended his attendance upon mass by Paul's example in visiting the temple (Acts 21: 26), but afterwards confessed at Geneva that he had acted under compulsion and sinned from fear of death. He concealed or denied on oath

facts which he afterwards had to admit. At Vienne he tried to lie himself out of danger and escaped; in Geneva he defied his antagonist and did his best, with the aid of the Libertines in the Council, to ruin him.

The severest charge against him is blasphemy. Bullinger remarked to a Pole that if Satan himself came out of hell he could use no more blasphemous language against the Trinity than this Spaniard; and Peter Martyr, who was present, assented and said that such a living son of the devil ought not to be tolerated anywhere. We cannot even now read some of his sentences against the doctrine of the Trinity without a shudder. Servetus lacked reverence and a decent regard for the most sacred feelings and convictions of those who differed from him. But there was a misunderstanding on both sides. He did not mean to blaspheme the true God in whom he believed himself, but only the three false and imaginary gods, as he wrongly conceived them to be, while to all orthodox Christians they were the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit of the one true, eternal, blessed Godhead.

He labored under the fanatical delusion that he was called by Providence to reform the Church and to restore the Christian religion. He deemed himself wiser than all the fathers, schoolmen, and Reformers. He supported his delusion by a fanciful interpretation of the last and darkest book of the Bible.

Calvin and Farel saw, in his refusal to recant, only the obstinacy of an incorrigible heretic and blasphemer. We must recognize in it the strength of his conviction. He forgave his enemies; he asked the pardon even of Calvin. Why should we not forgive him? He had a deeply religious nature. We must honor his enthusiastic devotion to the Scriptures and to the person of Christ. From the prayers and ejaculations inserted in his book, and from his dying cry for mercy, it is evident that he worshipped Jesus Christ as his Lord and Saviour.

THE THEOLOGY OF SERVETUS.

To the cotemporaries of Servetus his last and maturest work, *The Restitution of Christianity*, appeared to be a confused compound of Sabellian, Gnosaitic, Arian, Apollinarian, and Pelagian heresies, mixed with Anabaptist errors and Neo-platonic, pantheistic speculations. The best judges—Calvin, Saissset, Trechsel, Baur, Dörner, Harnack—find the root of his system in pantheism. Tollin denies his pantheism, although he admits the pantheistic coloring of some of his expressions; he distinguishes no less than five phases in his theology before it came to its full maturity, and characterizes it as an “intensive, extensive, and protensive Panchristism, or ‘Christocentricism.’”

Servetus was a mystic theosophist and Christopantheist. Far from being a skeptic or rationalist, he had very strong positive convictions of the absolute truth of the Christian religion. He regarded the Bible as an infallible source of truth, and accepted the traditional canon without dispute. So far he agreed with evangelical Protestantism; but he differed from it, as well as from Romanism, in principle and aim. He claimed to stand above both parties as the restorer of primitive Christianity, which excludes the errors and combines the truths of the Catholic and Protestant creeds.

The evangelical Reformation, inspired by the teaching of St. Paul and Augustin, was primarily a practical movement, and proceeded from a deep sense of sin and grace in opposition to prevailing Pelagianism, and pointed the people directly to Christ as the sole and sufficient fountain of pardon and peace to the troubled conscience; but it retained all the articles of the Apostles' Creed, and especially the doctrines of the Trinity and Incarnation.

Servetus, with the Bible as his guide, aimed at a more radical revolution than the Reformers. He started with a new doctrine of God and of Christ, and undermined the very foundations of the Catholic creed. The three most prominent *negative* features of his system are three denials: the denial of the orthodox dogma of the Trinity, as set forth in the Nicene Creed; the

denial of the orthodox Christology, as determined by the Œcumenical Council of Chalcedon; and the denial of infant baptism, as practised everywhere except by the Anabaptists. From these three sources he derived all the evils and corruptions of the Church. The first two denials were the basis of the theoretical revolution, the third was the basis of the practical revolution which he felt himself providentially called to effect by his anonymous book.

Those three negations in connection with what appeared to be shocking blasphemy, though not intended as such, made him an object of horror to all orthodox Christians of his age, Protestants as well as Roman Catholic, and led to his double condemnation, first at Vienne, and then at Geneva. So far he was perfectly understood by his contemporaries, especially by Calvin and Melancthon. But the *positive* features, which he substituted for the Nicene and Chalcedonian orthodoxy, were not appreciated in their originality, and seemed to be simply a repetition of old and long-condemned heresies.

There were Antitrinitarians before Servetus, not only in the ante-Nicene age, but also in the sixteenth century, especially among the Anabaptists—such as Hetzer, Denck, Campanus, Melchior, Hoffmann, Reed, Martini, David Joris. But he gathered their sporadic ideas into a coherent original system, and gave them a speculative foundation.

1. CHRISTOLOGY.

Servetus begins the "Restitution," as well as his first book against the Trinity, with the doctrine of Christ. He rises from the humanity of the historical Jesus of Nazareth to his Messiahship and Divine Sonship, and from this to His divinity. This is, we may say, the view of the Synoptical Gospels, as distinct from the usual orthodox method which, with the Prologue of the fourth Gospel, descends from His divinity to His humanity through the act of the incarnation of the second person of the Trinity. In this respect he anticipates the modern humanitarian Christology. Jesus is, according to Servetus, begot-

ten, not of the first person of God, but of the essence of the one undivided and indivisible God. He is born, according to the flesh, of the Virgin Mary by the overshadowing cloud of the Spirit (Matt. 1: 18, 20, 23; Luke 1: 32, 35). The whole aim of the gospel is to lead men to believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God (comp. John 20: 31). But the term "Son of God" is in the Scriptures always used of the man Jesus, and never of the Logos. He is the one true and natural son of God, born of the substance of God; we are sons by adoption, by an act of grace. We are made sons of God by faith (John 1: 12; Gal. 3: 26; Rom. 8: 23; Eph. 1: 5). He is, moreover, truly and veritably God. The whole essence of God is manifest in Him; God dwells in Him bodily.

To his last breath Servetus worshipped Jesus as the Son of the eternal God. But he did not admit Him to be the *eternal* Son of God, except in an ideal and pantheistic sense, in which the whole world was in the mind of God from eternity, and comprehended in the Divine Wisdom (*Sophia*) and the Divine Word (*Logos*).

He opposed the Chalcedonian dualism and aimed (like Apollinarius) at an organic unity of Christ's person, but made Him a full human personality (while Apollinarius substituted the divine Logos for the human spirit, and thus made Christ only a half man). He charges the scholastic and orthodox divines, whom he calls sophists and opponents of the truth, with making two Sons of God—one invisible and eternal, another visible and temporal. They deny, he says, that Jesus is truly man by teaching that He has two distinct natures with a communication of attributes. Christ does not consist of, or in, two natures. He had no previous personal pre-existence as a second hypostasis: His personality dates from His conception and birth. But this man Jesus is, at the same time, consubstantial with God (*ὁμοούσιος*). As man and wife are one in the flesh of their son, so God and man are one in Christ. The flesh of Christ is heavenly and born of the very substance of God. By the deification of the flesh of Christ he materialized God, destroyed the real humanity of Christ, and lost himself in the maze of a pantheistic mysticism.

2. UNITY AND TRINITY.

The fundamental doctrine of Servetus was the absolute unity, simplicity, and indivisibility of the Divine Being, in opposition to the tripersonality or threefold hypostasis of orthodoxy. In this respect he makes common cause with the Jews and Mohammedans, and approvingly quotes the Koran. He violently assails Athanasius, Hilary, Augustin, John of Damascus, Peter the Lombard, and other champions of the dogma of the Trinity. But he claims the ante-Nicene Fathers, especially Justin, Clement of Alexandria, Irenæus, and Tertullian, for his view. He calls all Trinitarians "tritheists" and "atheists." They have not one absolute God, but a three-parted, collective, composite God—that is, an unthinkable, impossible God, which is no God at all. They worship three idols of the demons,—a three-headed monster, like the Cerberus of the Greek mythology. One of their gods is unbegotten, the second is begotten, the third proceeding. One died, the other two did not die. Why is not the Spirit begotten, and the Son proceeding? By distinguishing the Trinity in the abstract from the three persons separately considered, they have even four gods. The Talmud and the Koran, he thinks, are right in opposing such nonsense and blasphemy.

Yet, after all, he taught himself a sort of trinity, but substitutes the terms "dispositions," "dispensations," "economies," for hypostases and persons. In other words, he believed, like Sabellius, in a trinity of revelation or manifestation, but not in a trinity of essence or substance. He even avowed, during the trial at Geneva, a trinity of persons and the eternal personality of Christ; but he understood the term "person" in the original sense of a mask used by players on the stage, not in the orthodox sense of a distinct hypostasis or real personality that had its own proper life in the Divine essence from eternity, and was manifest in time in the man Jesus.

Servetus distinguished—with Plato, Philo, the Neo-Platonists, and several of the Greek Fathers—between an ideal, in-

visible, uncreated, eternal world and the real, visible, created, temporal world. In God, he says, are from eternity the ideas or forms of all things: these are called "Wisdom" or "Logos," "the Word" (John 1: 1). He identifies this ideal world with "the Book of God," wherein are recorded all things that happen (Deut. 32: 32; Ps. 139: 16; Rev. 5: 1), and with the living creatures and four whirling wheels full of eyes, in the vision of Ezekiel (1: 5; 10: 12). The eyes of God are living fountains in which are reflected all things, great and small, even the hairs of our head (Matt. 10: 30), but particularly the elect, whose names are recorded in a special book.

All things are one in God, in whom they consist. There is one fundamental ground or principle and head of all things, and this is Jesus Christ our Lord.

In the fifth book Servetus discusses the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. He identifies Him with the Word, from which He differs only in the form of existence. God is, figuratively speaking, the Father of the Spirit, as He is the Father of Wisdom and the Word. The Spirit is not a third metaphysical being, but the Spirit of God Himself. To receive the Holy Spirit means to receive the anointing of God. The indwelling of the Spirit in us is the indwelling of God (1 Cor. 3: 16; 6: 19; 2 Cor. 6: 16; Eph. 2: 22). He who lies to the Holy Spirit lies to God (Acts 5: 4). The Spirit is a *modus*, a form of divine existence. He is also called the Spirit of Christ and the Spirit of the Son (Gal. 4: 6; Rom. 8: 9; 1 Pet. 1: 11). The human spirit is a spark of the Divine Spirit, an image of the Wisdom of God, created, yet similar. God breathes His Spirit into man in his birth, and again in regeneration.

In connection with this subject, Servetus goes into an investigation of the vital spirits in man, and gives a minute description of the lesser circulation of the blood, which he first discovered. He studied theology as a physician and surgeon, and studied medicine as a theologian.

3. CHRISTOPANTHEISM.

The premises and conclusions of the speculations of Servetus are pantheistic. He frequently refers with approval to Plato and the Neo-Platonists. "All is one and one is all, because all things are one in God, and God is the substance of all things." "As the Word of God is essentially man, so the Spirit of God is essentially the spirit of man. By the power of the resurrection all the primitive elements of the body and spirit have been renewed, glorified and immortalized, and all these are communicated to us by Christ in baptism and the Lord's Supper. The Holy Spirit is the breath from the mouth of Christ (John 20: 22). As God breathes into man the soul with the air, so Christ breathes into His disciples the Holy Spirit with the air. . . . The deity in the stone is stone, in gold it is gold, in the wood it is wood, according to the proper ideas of things. In a more excellent way the deity in man is man, in the spirit it is spirit." "God dwells in the Spirit, and God is Spirit. God dwells in the fire, and God is fire; God dwells in the light, and God is light; God dwells in the mind, and He is the mind itself. In one of his letters to Calvin he says: "Containing the essence of the universe in Himself, God is everywhere, and in everything, and in such wise that He shows Himself to us as fire, as a flower, as a stone." God is always in the process of becoming. Evil as well as good is comprised in his essence. He quotes Isa. 45: 7: "I form the light, and create darkness; I make peace, and create evil; I am the Lord, that doeth all these things." The evil differs from the good only in the direction.

When Calvin charged him with pantheism, Servetus re-stated his view in these words: "God is in all things by essence, presence and power, and Himself sustains all things." Calvin admitted this, but denied the inference that the substantial Deity is in all creatures, and, as the latter confessed before the judges, even in the pavement on which they stand, and in the devils. In his last reply to Calvin he tells him: "With Simon

Magus, you shut up God in a corner; I say that He is all in all things; all beings are sustained in God."

But his views differ from the ordinary pantheism. He substitutes for a cosmopanteism a *Christopanteism*. Instead of saying, The world is the great God, he says, *Christ* is the great God. By Christ, however, he means only the ideal Christ; for he denied the eternity of the real or historical Christ.

4. ANTHROPOLOGY AND SOTERIOLOGY.

Servetus was called a Pelagian by Calvin. This is true only with some qualifications. He denied absolute predestination and the slavery of the human will, as taught first by all the Reformers. He admitted the fall of Adam in consequence of the temptation by the devil, and he admitted also hereditary sin (which Pelagius denied), but not hereditary guilt. Hereditary sin is only a disease for which the child is not responsible. (This was also the view of Zwingli.) There is no guilt without knowledge of good and evil. Actual transgression is not possible before the time of age and responsibility, that is, about the twentieth year. He infers this from such passages as Ex. 30: 14; 38: 26; Num. 14: 29; 32: 11; Deut. 1: 39.

The serpent has entered human flesh and taken possession of it. There is a thorn in the flesh, a law of the members antagonistic to the law of God; but this does not condemn infants, nor is it taken away in baptism (as the Catholics hold), for it dwells even in saints, and the conflict between the spirit and the serpent goes on through life. But Christ offers His help to all, even to infants and their angels.

In the fallen state man has still a free will, reason and conscience, which connect him with the divine grace. Man is still the image of God. Hence the punishment of murder, which is an attack upon the divine majesty in man (Gen. 9: 6). Every man is enlightened by the Logos (John 1: 17). We are of divine origin (Acts 17: 29). The doctrine of the slavery of the human will is a great fallacy (*magna fallacia*), and turns divine grace into a pure machine. It makes men idle, and neglect

prayer, fasting and almsgiving. God is free Himself, and gives freedom to every man, and His grace works freely in man. It is our impiety which turns the gift of freedom into slavery. The Reformers blaspheme God by their doctrine of total depravity and their depreciation of good works. All true philosophers and theologians teach that divinity is implanted in man, and that the soul is of the same essence with God.

As to predestination, there is, strictly speaking, no before nor after in God, as He is not subject to time. But He is just and merciful to all His creatures, especially to the little flock of the elect. He condemns no one who does not condemn himself.

5. THE SACRAMENTS.

Servetus admitted only two sacraments, thereby agreeing with the Protestants, but held original views on both.

(a) As to the sacrament of Baptism, he taught, with the Catholic Church, baptismal regeneration, but rejected, with the Anabaptists, infant baptism.

Baptism is a saving ordinance by which we receive the remission of sins, are made Christians, and enter the kingdom of heaven as priests and kings, through the power of the Holy Spirit who sanctifies the water. It is the death of the old man and the birth of the new man. By baptism we put on Christ and live a new life in Him.

But baptism must be preceded by the preaching of the gospel, the illumination of the Spirit, and repentance, which, according to the preaching of John the Baptist and of Christ, is the necessary condition of entering the kingdom of God. Therefore, Servetus infers, no one is a fit subject for baptism before he has reached manhood. By the law of Moses priests were not anointed before the thirtieth year (Num. 4: 3). Joseph was thirty years old when he was raised from the prison to the throne (Gen. 41: 46). According to the rabbinical tradition Adam was born or created in his thirtieth year. Christ was baptized in the Jordan when He was thirty years (Luke 3: 21-23), and that is the model of all true Christian baptism. He was

circumcised in infancy, but the carnal circumcision is the type of the spiritual circumcision of the heart, not of water baptism. Circumcision was adapted to real infants who have not yet committed actual transgression; baptism is intended for spiritual infants—that is, for responsible persons who have a childlike spirit and begin a new life.

(b) Servetus rejected Infant Baptism as irreconcilable with these views, and as absurd. He called it a doctrine of the devil, an invention of popery, and a total subversion of Christianity. He saw in it the second root of all the corruptions of the Church, as the dogma of the Trinity was the first root.

Children are unfit to perform the office of priests which is given to us in baptism. They have no faith, they cannot repent, and cannot enter into a covenant. Moreover, they do not need the bath of regeneration for the remission of sins, as they have not yet committed actual transgression.

But children are not lost if they die without baptism. Adam's sin is remitted to all by the merits of Christ. They are excluded from the Church on earth; they must die and go to Sheol; but Christ will raise them up on the resurrection day and save them in heaven. The Scripture does not condemn the Ismaelites or the Ninevites or other barbarians. Christ gives His blessing to unbaptized children. How could the most merciful Lord, who bore the sins of a guilty world, condemn those who have not committed an impiety?

Servetus agreed with Zwingli, the Anabaptists and the Second Scotch Confession, in rejecting the cruel Roman dogma, which excludes all unbaptized infants, even of Christian parents, from the kingdom of heaven.

(c) In the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, Servetus differs from the Roman Catholic, the Lutheran, and the Zwinglian theories, and approaches, strange to say, the doctrine of his great antagonist Calvin. Baptism and the Lord's Supper represent the birth and the nourishment of the new man. By the former we receive the spirit of Christ; by the latter we receive the body of Christ, but in a spiritual and mystical manner.

Baptism kindles and strengthens faith; the eucharist strengthens love and unites us more and more to Christ. By neglecting this ordinance the spiritual man famishes and dies away. The heavenly man needs heavenly food, which nourishes him to life eternal (John 6: 53).

Servetus distinguishes three false theories on the Lord's Supper, and calls their advocates *transubstantiatores* (Romanists), *impanatores* (Lutherans), and *tropistæ* (Zwinglians).

Against the first two theories, which agree in teaching a literal presence and manducation of Christ's body and blood by all communicants, he urges that spiritual food cannot be received by the mouth and stomach, but only by the spiritual organs of faith and love. He refers, like Zwingli, to the passage in John 6: 63, as the key for understanding the words of institution and of the mysterious discourse on eating the flesh and drinking the blood of Christ.

He is most severe against the papal doctrine of transubstantiation or transelementation, because it turns bread into no-bread, and would make us believe that the body of Christ is eaten even by wild beasts, dogs and mice. He calls this dogma a Satanic monstrosity and an invention of demons.

To the Tropists he concedes that bread and wine are symbols, but he objects to the idea of the absence of Christ in heaven. They are symbols of a really present, not of an absent Christ. He is the living head and vitally connected with all His members. A head cut off from the body would be a monster. To deny the real presence of Christ is to destroy His reign. He came to us to abide with us forever. He withdrew only His visible presence till the day of judgment, but promised to be with us invisibly, but none the less really, to the end of the world.

6. THE KINGDOM OF CHRIST AND THE REIGN OF ANTICHRIST.

We have already noticed the apocalyptic fancies of Servetus. He could not find the kingdom of God or the kingdom of heaven, so often spoken of in the Gospels (while Christ speaks only

twice of the "Church"), in any visible church organization of his day. The true Church flourished in the first three centuries, but then fled into the wilderness, pursued by the dragon; there she has a place prepared by God, and will remain a thousand two hundred and threescore prophetic days or years (Rev. 12: 6)—that is, from 325 to 1585.

The reign of Antichrist, with its corruptions and abominations, began with three contemporaneous events: The first Ecumenical Council of Nicaea (325), which split the one Godhead into three idols; the Union of Church and State under Constantine, when the king became a monk; and the establishment of the papacy under Sylvester, when the bishop became a king. From the same period he dates the general practice of infant baptism with its destructive consequences. Since that time the true Christians were everywhere persecuted and not allowed to assemble. They were scattered as sheep in the wilderness.

Servetus fully agreed with the Reformers in opposition to the papacy as an antichristian power, but went much further, and had no better opinion of the Protestant churches. He called the Roman Church "the most beastly of beasts and the most impudent of harlots."

He finds no less than sixty signs or marks of the reign of Antichrist in the eschatological discourses of Christ, in Daniel (chs. 7 and 12), in Paul (2 Thess. 2: 3, 4; 1 Tim. 4: 1), and especially in the Apocalypse (chs. 13-18).

But this reign is now drawing to a close. The battle of Michael with Antichrist has already begun in heaven and on earth, and the author of the "Restitution" has sounded the trumpet of war, which will end in the victory of Christ and the true Church. Servetus might have lived to see the millennium (in 1585), but he expected to fall in the battle, and to share in the first resurrection.

He concludes his eschatological chapter on the reign of Antichrist with these words: "Whosoever truly believes that the pope is Antichrist, will also truly believe that the papistical trinity, paedobaptism, and the other sacraments of popery are

doctrines of dæmons. O Christ Jesus, thou Son of God, most merciful deliverer, who so often didst deliver Thy people from distresses, deliver us poor sinners from this Babylonian captivity of Antichrist, from his hypocrisy, his tyranny, and his idolatry. Amen."

7. ESCHATOLOGY.

Servetus was charged by Calvin and the Council of Geneva with denying the immortality of the soul. This was a heresy punishable by death. Etienne Dolet was executed on the place, Maubert at Paris, Aug. 2, 1546, for this denial. But Servetus denied the charge. He taught that the soul was mortal, that it deserved to die on account of sin, but that Christ communicates to it new life by grace. Christ has brought immortality to light (2 Tim. 1: 10; 1 Pet. 1: 21-25). This seems to be the doctrine of conditional immortality of believers. But he held that all the souls of the departed go to the gloomy abode of Sheol to undergo a certain purification before judgment. This is the baptism of blood and fire, as distinct from the baptism of water and spirit (1 Cor. 3: 11-15). The good and bad are separated in death. Those who die without being regenerated by Christ have no hope. The righteous progress in sanctification. They pray for us (for which he gives six reasons, and quotes Zech. 1: 12, 13; Luke 15: 10; 16: 27, 28; 1 Cor. 13: 18), but we ought not to pray for them, for they do not need our prayers, and there is no Scripture precept on the subject.

The reign of the pope or Antichrist will be followed by the millennial reign of Christ on earth (Rev. 20: 4-7). Then will take place the first resurrection.

Servetus was a chiliast, but not in the carnal Jewish sense. He blames Melancthon for deriding, with the papal crowd, all those as chiliasts who believe in the glorious reign of Christ on earth, according to the book of Revelation and the teaching of the school of St. John.

The general resurrection and judgment follow after the millennium. Men will be raised in the flower of manhood, the

thirtieth year—the year of baptismal regeneration, the year in which Christ was baptized and entered upon His public ministry. “Then wilt thou,” so he addresses Philip Melanchthon, who, next to Calvin, was his greatest enemy, “with all thy senses, see, feel, taste, and hear God Himself. If thou dost not believe this, thou dost not believe in a resurrection of the flesh and a bodily transformation of thy organs.”

After the general judgment, Christ will surrender His mediatorial reign with its glories to the Father, and God will be all in all (Acts 3: 21; 1 Cor. 15: 24–28.)*

*This account is taken from a rare copy of the *Restitutio Christianisma*. The first edition of 1,000 was destroyed except 4 copies; but a small edition was reprinted in 1790 from the original copy which is preserved in the Imperial Library at Vienna. See the bibliography on Servetus in the Seventh volume of Schaff's *Church History*, pp. 681 sqq., which has just been published by Charles Scribner's Sons, New York.

II.

REFORMED CHURCH ARCHIVES.

PAPERS IN THE REIFF CASE, 1730-1749.

EDITED BY REV. J. H. DUBBS, D.D.

THE Reformed Church in the United States proposes to celebrate, during the present year, the centennial anniversary of its act of separation from the Church of Holland, and the consequent independent organization of its earliest synod. Though, like many important historical events, this action attracted little attention at the time of its occurrence, its results have proved so far-reaching as to render it well worthy of remembrance and commemoration. Holland had been to the infant churches of Pennsylvania a mother, kind though stern. Her liberality, extended through a long series of years, was perhaps unequalled in ecclesiastical history; but she insisted on submission to her discipline and unquestioning obedience to all her commandments. There had been, since 1747, an ecclesiastical organization, known as the Coetus, of which the synod became in a certain sense the historical continuation; but the powers of the earlier body were purely advisory, and none of its decisions were binding until they had been approved by the synods of Holland. With the best intentions in the world, "the fathers" could not possibly understand the real wants of the American churches. They continued to send German ministers; but not one of their own number is known to have crossed the ocean for the purpose of becoming personally acquainted with the recipients of their charity. The Coetus was not permitted to confer the rite of ordination, except in extraordinary cases, and

then only after permission had been granted by the authorities in Holland. These arrangements were, to say the least, extremely inconvenient; and two or three years sometimes passed before on important questions a final decision could be reached. It is remarkable that, under the circumstances, the Dutch connection remained so long unbroken; but after the war of the Revolution the bond gradually grew weaker, and when it broke the event occasioned no surprise. At the meeting of the Coetus held in Philadelphia on the 27th of April, 1793, the following action was taken:

"Inasmuch as we have not yet received a reply to our last letters and proceedings, it was resolved by a majority of votes that for the present we will transmit to our Fathers in Holland only a letter, but not our proceedings." By this action—for which the way had been carefully prepared at previous meetings—the relations with Holland appear to have been merely suspended; but they were never resumed, and the Coetus became a Synod.

As a contribution to the celebration of these events we propose to publish some of the original documents, concerning the relations of the German churches of Pennsylvania to the Church of Holland, which are preserved in the Library of the Historical Society, at Lancaster. These papers were collected by Drs. Mayer, Harbaugh, and others, and are of great historical value. Though possibly uninteresting to the general reader, the future historian will appreciate them; and as, with all our care, the originals are in danger of accidental destruction, or of becoming illegible with age, it becomes a duty to render their contents permanent by publication. Other denominations have printed their early records in splendid volumes, the expense of publication being in some instances defrayed by a single individual, who has thus honored himself by permanently attaching his name to the history of his church. Possibly the exhibition of a few specimens from our archives may encourage some one to aid us in uncovering the mine of historic wealth which lies unregarded at our feet.

Unfortunately for our purpose, the earliest documents in our possession are of such a character that we might wish the occasion for writing them had never occurred. They refer to "the Reiff case," which occupied the attention of the Church for many years. We shall not relate the story which is told at length in the papers which we here present. The paper marked A. is a copy of the commission given to Jacob Reiff to proceed to Europe, in company with the Rev. G. M. Weiss, to receive money which had been collected for the churches of Philadelphia and Skippack. It was filed by Reiff in the court of chancery, and may be presumed to be a correct copy of the original. B. is a bill of complaint to the Court, representing that Reiff has not rendered any account of the money collected in Europe, and praying that, pending an investigation, he may be prevented from leaving the province. C. is Reiff's answer to the bill of complaint, in which he defends himself at great length. It is interesting as giving the case of the defendant; but shows that he was, to say the least, very careless in keeping his accounts. D. and E. are letters written from Holland to Governor James Logan, soliciting his influence in the prosecution. Here, as elsewhere, errors in orthography and grammatical construction have been carefully retained as they appear in the original. It may have been through Logan's influence that the case was finally taken out of chancery and submitted to a board of arbitrators, in accordance with whose decision Schlatter finally received from Mr. Reiff about five hundred and fifty dollars, after which he published a card expressing his confidence in Mr. Reiff's integrity. It seems, however, that the community was impressed with the idea that the amount due was much greater, and accordingly poured the vials of its wrath on the head of Mr. Schlatter for consenting to such a settlement. We accordingly find in Saur's paper for Nov. 16, 1749, a personal card, or explanation, which may be regarded as the last paper in the Reiff case. With this document we conclude the series, which incidentally throws much light on the early history of the Reformed Church in Pennsylvania.

DOCUMENTS.

A.

COPIA.



Nachdem unser Her Pastor Weissen sich resolviret mit seinem bey sich habenden Geferten Jacob Reiffen nach England und Rotterdam eine reise zu thun um die Colecte welche da in loco um erbaung einer Kirche alhiealger Lande bereit liege, als wird Jacob Reiffen hiemit die Vollmacht gegeben alles zu besorgen, damit Herr Weiss mit solcher sogleich expedirt und zur rückkehr nach Pensylvanien begeben soll. Wie wir ihme dann alles auf sein gutes Gewissen übergeben, auch die Vollmacht in allem überlassen. Welches wir zur Steuer eigenhändig unterschreiben. So geschehen, Philadelphia d. 19 ten May, 1730. Es wird dabey gebeten Jacob Reif möchte alles auf solche Arth richten dass wenn Herr P. Weiss nicht mehr in das Land kommen wolte oder solte, Er als Reif sogleich einen von Heidelberg mit sich zu nehmen ihn auf das nöthigste zu besorgen: weilen wir wenn allenfalls die Collecten Gelder nicht mehr in loco wären nicht nöthig finden dass H. Weiss weiter sich zu verreissen, sondern nach bester besorgung er Jacob Reif die Briefe an behörigen Orten zu besellen und selbst nach einen Antwort zu befragen. Mir sämmtl. Aeltesten der beyden Gemeinen zu Philadelphia und Schiebach.*

J. DIEMER, D. M. P.,

PIETER LECOLIE,

JOHANN WILLM RÖRIG,

HENRICH WELLER

GEORGE PETER HILLENGASS,

HANS MICHEL FRÖLICH,

MICHEL HILLENGASS.

WENDEL KEIBER,

DEOBALT JUNG,

CHRISTOFFEL SCHMITT,

GERHART (G. I. H.) IN DE HEVEN, S. N.,

GEORGE REIF,

GEORG PHILIP DODDER,

* The meaning of this document is not quite clear. It is incorrectly written, and several words are evidently omitted. The following is, however, as nearly as possible a literal translation:

Forasmuch as our pastor Weiss, in company with his travelling companion, Jacob Reiff, has resolved to take a journey to England and Rotterdam, for the purpose of receiving a collection which is said to be ready in loco, to be applied to the establishment of a church in these provinces; therefore authority is herewith given to Jacob Reiff to take entire charge, so that Mr. Weiss may be expedited on his immediate return with the same to Pennsylvania. Therefore, we also entrust everything to his good conscience, and give him plenary power in everything. In testimony whereof we sign our names. Given at Philadelphia, May 19, 1730.

We hereby request Jacob Reiff to arrange matters in such a way that if Pastor Weiss should or would not return to this country, he, Reiff, may at once bring with him a minister from Heidelberg, and provide him with whatever is most necessary; because if the monies collected should at any rate be no longer in loco we do not deem it necessary that Mr. Weiss should further extend his journey; but that according to his best judgment, Jacob Reiff should deliver the letters at their proper destination and personally make inquiries for a reply:

Signed by all the elders of the congregation at Philadelphia and Skippack

B.

PHILADELPHIA, Nov. 23, 1732.

To the Honorable Patrick Gordon, Esqr., Lieut. Governor of the Province of Pennsylvania, etc. In Chancery.

The Petition of Jacob Diemer, Michael Hillegas, Peter Hillegas, Joost Schmidt, Hendrick Weller, Jacob Siegel, Wilhelm Rohrich. In Behalf of themselves and divers others members of the German Reformed Church in Philada.

In Humble Manner Sheweth.

That a great number of Protestants born under the Ligeance of the Emperor of Germany did about ten years since come over into this Province, and being settled in divers parts thereof, but especially in the city of Philada., formed themselves into a Religious Society, commonly called by the name of the German Reformed Church; for the good order and government whereof, by the advice of their minister, one George Michael Weiss, alias Weitzius, they appointed Church Wardens or Ancients: To which Trust your petitioners sometime in January last were called.

That in the year one thousand seven hundred and thirty the Worthy Synods of South and North Holland together with the Assembly of Deacons of the reformed church of the city of Amsterdam and the mayor and aldermen of the sd. city and other well disposed persons in tender consideration of the necessitous circumstances of the greatest part of the members of the sd. German reformed Church at Philada., did by Voluntary Contributions collect the sum of two thousand one hundred and ninety-seven guilders amounting to three hundred and two pounds sterling money of Great Britain, and the same sum did deposit in the hands of ye sd. George Michael Weitz (who together with the Deft. Jacob Reiff then in Holland, had been making application in behalf of the sd. Religious Society at Philada. for the Charities of piously disposed persons there.)

That the sd. George Michel Weitzius and the Deft. Reiff are since returned into this province and the said Weitzius is removed to Albany in the Government of New York: But before his Departure did render to these Compts. a Distinct Account in writing of the sums of money by him recd. so as afd., and did declare that he had delivered to the sd. Deft. the afd., two thousand one hundred and ninety-seven Guilders under special trust and Confidence that he the sd. Deft. should pay the same to the Church Wardens or Ancients of the Reformed Church at Philada. for the uses afd.

Notwithstanding which the sd. Jacob Reiff tho' often requested by these Compts. refuses to render any account of the sd. money, or from whom, or to what use he received the same, or to pay or give security for the payment thereof to the Church Wardens or Ancients afd.

And these Compts. further say, that they are informed and do verily believe that the sd. Jacob Reiff is about to depart this province and to transport himself into parts beyond the seas where the process of this Honorable Court of Chancery cannot reach him, all which matters and things do further appear by the affidavit hereunto annex.

In tender consideration whereof, & inasmuch as such proceedings are directly contrary to Equity and Good Conscience, may it please your Honour to grant unto your petitioners His Majesty's most gracious Writt of Ne Exeat provincia to the Sheriff of the County of Philada.

directed Commanding the sd. Sheriff that he cause the sd. Jacob Reiff to come before him and to find sufficient security that he will not depart this province without special license for the same or until he make answer to the Bill of Complaint of your petitioners and further then do and receive what by this Honble. Court shall in that behalf be awarded.

And your petitioners as in duty bound shall ever pray, &c.

Nov. 23, 1732, Be it so

p. Cancell.

R. Charles, Regr.

J. Growdon,

Conc. p. Querent.

C.

The answer of Jacob Reiff, defendant, to the bill of complaint of John Diemer, Michael Hillegass, Joest Schmidt, Hendrick Weller, Jacob Siegel and Wilhelm Rohrich, complainants.

This defendant saving and reserving to himself now and all times hereafter all and all manner of benefit and advantage of exception to the manifold errors, untruths, uncertainties, insufficiencies and imperfections in the said complainants bill of complaints contained, for answer thereunto or unto so much thereof as this defendant is advised is anyway material for him, this defendant to make answer unto, he answereth and saith he believes it to be true, that about ten years since, divers Protestants born under the ligeance of the emperor of Germany, did transport themselves into this province, from such inducements as in the complainants said bill of complaint is mentioned. And that in the year of our Lord one thousand seven hundred and twenty-seven, they formed themselves into a religious society as near as they could upon the model of the German Reformed Church, and that they unanimously chose to themselves George Michael Weitzius (alias Weiss) in the bill named for their pastor. And this defendant saith that for the better discipline and government of the said society, they divided themselves into two congregations, one of the said congregations called the German Reformed Church of Philadelphia, and the other called the German Reformed Church of Skippack. That each of the said congregations did in the year of our Lord one thousand seven hundred and twenty-seven, elect four church-wardens or elders, that Peter Locolie, Johan Wilhelm Roerig, Hendrick Weller, and Geo. Peter Hillegass were then elected church-wardens or elders for the German Reformed Church of Philadelphia, and Wendel Keiber, Gerhart In-de-Haven, Christopher Schmidt and George Reiff were then elected church-wardens or elders for the German Reformed Church of Skippack; and this defendant further saith that the said elders or church-wardens do still continue in their said office, there having been no new elders or church-wardens elected since by the said congregations, or either of them, as this defendant knows or believes. And this defendant doth deny that John Diemer, Michael Hillegass, Joest Schmidt and Jacob Siegel or either of them was ever elected or appointed elders or church-wardens of the said German Reformed Church of Philadelphia or of Skippack, or of any other place or church within this province, according to the rules, order, and customs of the said church of Philadelphia or Skippack, or any other German Reformed Church within this province as this defendant knows or believes. Wherefore, this defendant humbly conceives and is advised that neither the said complainants John Diemer, Michael Hillegass, Joest Schmidt, and Jacob Siegel, nor either of them, nor the said complainants Hendrick Weller and William Rohrich, with.

out the rest of the said church-wardens or elders of the said German Reformed Church of Philadelphia together with the church-wardens or elders of the German Reformed Church of Skippack, have any right to call this defendant to account for the matters and things alleged in the said bill of complaint. But for-as-much as this defendant is willing that a just and true account may be rendered of all his actings and doings in relation to the trust mentioned in the complainants' said Bill of Complaint, and that this defendant may be discharged from the said trust and have the direction of this honorable court therein, he further answereth and saith that the said congregations of Philadelphia and Skippack in conjunction with their minister George Michael Weitzius (alias Weiss) did prefer a petition to the excellent Classis of Divinity in the United Provinces, which petition this defendant saith was signed and subscribed by the church-wardens or elders of both the said congregations of Philadelphia and Skippack, and (as this defendant remembers) it set forth the unhappy and necessitous condition of the said congregations and prayed the charitable donations of the said Classis, and this defendant delivered the said petition to Doctor Wilhelmus in the bill named. This defendant believes a report was spread in Pensilvania that collections of money had thereupon been made, and that before such news arrived the said George Michael Weitzius (alias Weiss) had prepared to return to Holland or Germany, and that upon receiving the said news the said congregations or one of them might entreat him to stay, to which the said George Michael Weitzius (alias Weiss) might make such answer as in the complainants said bill of complaint is set forth, and might promise to serve them to the utmost of his power; and this defendant doth acknowledge himself to have been a member of the German Reformed Church of Skippack from its first establishment, but not of the German Reformed Church of Philadelphia, as in the bill charged. And this defendant doth deny that he usually traded into Holland or Germany, as in the complainants said bill of complaint is falsely suggested, other than and except that this defendant went over there in the year of our Lord one thousand seven hundred and twenty-seven to fetch his relations, and laid out his money (as passengers generally do) in goods fit for sale in this country. And this defendant saith that before or since that time he never carried on any trade to or from Holland or Germany (except as hereinafter mentioned). And this defendant doth admit that he was acquainted with Doctor Wilhelmus in the bill named, and was informed by him that a collection had been made in favor of the said congregations of the German reformed Church of Philadelphia and Skippack to the amount of about two hundred guilders, but knows not of his own knowledge what sum was collected. And this defendant saith that the said Doctor Wilhelmus requested him this defendant to receive the monies so collected for the use of the sd. congregations of Philadelphia and Skippack. But this defendant absolutely refused so to do, having been informed by letter from some of his friends in Pensilvania that some of the members of the sd. congregations were jealous or entertained some suspicions of this defendants' honesty, or to that purpose. And this defendant saith that he this defendant returned to Holland from Pensylvania in August in the year of our Lord 1729 and denies that he did acquaint the said congregations, church-wardens or elders, or any person or persons whatsoever, that he intended a voyage to Holland and from thence to Frankfurt in Germany, or that he should be glad of the company of the said

George Michael Weitzius (alias Weiss) or that he would willingly assist him in doing any service he could to his brethren of the Reformed Church of Philadelphia; or that if he should stand in need of any money for that purpose or for his own private wants that he this defendant would furnish him, or anything to that or the like purpose, as in the said bill of complaint is falsely suggested. But on the contrary this defendant saith that on his return from Holland to Pensilvania in the year of our Lord 1729 as aforesaid (or any time afterwards till prevailed on as hereafter mentioned) he had no thought or design of going abroad any more. But several of the church-wardens or elders of the said congregations of Philada. and Skippack and the said George Michael Weitzius (alias Wei-s) frequently applied to the defendant and earnestly entreated him to go to Holland and Germany once more, to accompany and assist the said George Michael Weitzius (alias Weiss) in collecting and receiving monies collected and to be collected for the use of the said congregations. And the better to prevail on this defendant to comply with their request they voluntarily and of their own accord faithfully promised that they would reimburse and pay to him this defendant all costs and charges and expenses that he should be at in the said voyage, and that they would likewise pay and allow him any reasonable satisfaction for his time and trouble therein. But this defendant often refused to take the said voyage, this defendant being then employed in carrying on certain buildings on his plantation at Skippack, and it was likely to be very prejudicial to this defendants affairs. And this defendant saith that in order to get rid of their importunities he endeavored to get some other person to undertake the said voyage in his stead and accordingly offered £5 out of his own pocket to one Hans William Rohrich who was willing to go. But neither of the said congregations thought fit to trust him. And this defendant saith that by the continued importunities of the said members of the said congregations, their elders or church-wardens and minister, induced by their fair promises expecting that agreeable thereto he should be reimbursed all the charge and expense he should be at and be also generously rewarded for his trouble and upon the said elders or church-wardens signing an instrument for that purpose he the said defendant was at length prevailed upon to undertake the said voyage, tho' hazardous, troublesome and very prejudicial to this defendants affairs and interest, and the great displeasure and uneasiness of his most intimate friends and relations. And this defendant saith that true it is a power was given to this defendant signed by the elders or church-wardens of both the said congregations of Philadelphia and Skippack, but denies that the said power is of the purport or contents in the bill set forth, or that he was thereby enjoined to observe the directions of the Classis in Holland, as may appear by the said power now in the defendants possession and ready to be produced to this honorable court, a copy whereof is to this defendants answer annexed, which this defendant prays may be taken as part of this his answer. And this defendant doth admit that at the time when the said power was given said George Michael Weitzius (alias Weiss) was absent and this defendant believes it was given without his knowledge. And this defendant doth admit that such application was made and such instrument signed by your honor as in said complainants' said bill of complaint is mentioned. And this defendant saith he believes it to be true that such a book called a collect-book, as in the bill mentioned, was prepared by the church-wardens or elders of

the said congregations, but knows it not of his own knowledge. But this defendant saith that when the said George Michael Weitzius (alias Weiss) was about to leave Holland and return to Pensilvania he the said George Michael Weitzius (alias Weiss) delivered this defendant a book which in the title page thereof (wrote in High Dutch) is called 'a general book of collects made for the use of the reformed High Dutch congregations of Philadelphia and Skipack in Pensilvania, which certifies for a testimony of truth their minister together with the elders or church-wardens.' Underneath which title or writing is subscribed the names of the said minister George Michael Weitzius (alias Weiss) and the names of the said elders or church-wardens of the said congregations of Philadelphia and Skipack, in which said book is also contained certain memorandums and copies wrote (as this defendant verily believes) by the said George Michael Weitzius (alias Weiss) in which memorandums is mentioned to have been given several sums of money to the amount of two thousand and one hundred guilders and upward, which book the said defendant now hath in his custody and is ready to produce to this honorable court. This defendant saith he embarked with the said George Michael Weitzius (alias Weiss) for Holland and arrived there about the time the complainants' said bill of complaint mentioned, and that upon their arrival the said George Michael Weitzius (alias Weiss) and this defendant made application to Doctor Wilhelmus and other persons for the colle ted money above mentioned, and requested the same might be paid to the said George Michael Weitzius (alias Weiss) for the use of the said congregations of Philadelphia and Skipack, and the said George Michael Weitzius (alias Weiss) did several times receive several sums of money on that account, but how much or to what sums this defendant cannot remember. And this defendant saith that the said George Michael Weitzius (alias Weiss) being about to leave Hollaud and return to Pensilvania this defendant did produce the power above mentioned to be given this defendant by the said elders or church-wardens and the said George Michael Weitzius (alias Weiss) did also then give this defendant another power to act in the premises in his absence, but did not enjoin him to follow the directions of the Classis in Holland neither did this defendant promise him so to do. Nevertheless this defendant saith he always observed and punctually followed the direction of the said Classis and Presides of Holland in managing the affair so committed to his care for the said congregations, and that the said Classis and Presides of Holland never gave this defendant any other directions than the manner and places how and where the monies should be collected, as this defendant knows or remembers. And this defendant denies he ever acquainted the said George Michael Weitzius (alias Weiss) that he designed to go and trade at Frankfort in Germany, neither had this defendant any other trade or business there than to collect money for the said congregations of Philadelphia and Skipack and otherwise to negotiate their affairs. And this defendant doth deny he ever received the sum of two thousand one hundred and thirty-two guilders and twelve stivers, or any sum or sums of money whatsoever of the said George Michael Weitzius (alias Weiss). But saith that by virtue of a letter or order from Mr. John Leonhard Van Asten, of Rotterdam, to whom this said defendant believes the said George Michael Weitzius (alias Weiss) has paid seven hundred and fifty guilders, this defendant received of Messieurs Charles and Isaac Behaghe at Frankfort, the like sum of seven hundred and

fifty guilders of Holland's currency for the use of the said congregations of the German Reformed Church of Philadelphia and Skippack, amounting to about one hundred and twelve pounds, ten shillings and one-half penny of the currency of this province of Pensilvania. And this defendant saith he also received for the use of the said congregations as follows: Of the Reformed Dutch congregation at Frankfort, forty guilders; of the Reformed French Church at Frankfort, twenty guilders; of the Reformed French Church of Hanan, twelve guilders; of the Reformed Low Dutch Church of Hanau, four guilders; amounting in the whole to seventy six Dutch guilders or florins, of the value of about eleven pounds eleven shillings and eleven pence half-penny which together with the above sum of one hundred and twelve pounds ten shillings and one half-penny makes the sum of one hundred and twenty three pounds eighteen shillings Pensilvania currency. And this defendant further saith that he hath received no further or other sum or sums of money for the use of the said congregations of Philadelphia and Skippack of any person or persons whatsoever; that the names of the congregations or churches who paid the same and the several sums by them paid is inserted in the collect-book above mentioned. And this defendant doth deny that he ever suggested that by trading to Germany he could improve the said money so committed to his care to the great advantage of the said congregations of Philadelphia and Skippack, or either of them, or anything tending to that purpose. And this defendant further saith—that some small time before he received the said monies, he, together with the said George Michael Weitzius (alias Weiss) did consult and advise with Doctor Wilhelmus in the bill named about disposing of the same, and it was then proposed by the said George Michael Weitzius (alias Weiss) that it should be laid out in goods and merchandise which the sd. Doctor Wilhelmus approved of, and the sd. George Michael Weitzius (alias Weiss) directed this defendant to lay out what money should come to his hands in certain goods and merchandise, a particular whereof he delivered to this defendant in writing, intimating that it would be much more for the advantage of the sd. congregation than to carry it over in specie. And this defendant saith that he, this defendant, did accordingly lay out and expend all the said money so by him received in purchasing the said goods pursuant to the said directions, which goods this defendant (being about to return to Philadelphia) caused to be shipped on board the ship called the Brittaina Galley, Michael Franklyn, master, then bound for Philadelphia, for the use and on the proper account and risk of the said congregations of Philada. and Skippack. And this defendant further saith that at the time the said ship was about to sail the said Doctor Wilhelmus ordered and directed this defendant to go to the Synod for North and South Holland, held at Dordrecht, which this defendant accordingly did, being unwilling to omit anything that might tend to the interest or service of the said congregations of Philadelphia and Skippack, that this defendant returned with all possible expedition to Rotterdam. But (to this defendant's great surprise) the said ship was sailed for England in order to be cleared of the custom house there, that she might lawfully proceed on her said voyage to Philadelphia, to the great damage of this defendant, his clothes, effects and provisions being on board; that the master of the said ship being unwilling to advance any money for the duty or customs of the goods so shipped for the use of the said congregations as aforesaid, left them in the custody of the collector of His Majesty's cus-

toms at Cowes, in the Isle of Wight (where the said ship went to clear) as this defendant is informed by letters from Mr. John Hope, a merchant there; that this defendant arrived at Cowes in or about June, in the year of our Lord 1782, on his voyage to Philadelphia, and then endeavored as much as in him lay to get the said goods with him. But before the defendant or the collector of customs could procure an account of what sum was due for customs and duties, the ship this defendant went in was ready to sail and he was forced to go away without them. But this defendant saith that before his departure from said island he left in the hands of the said Mr. John Hope (who is reputed an eminent merchant there) forty-nine pistoles of gold of the value about £68, 12s. Pensilvania currency, in order to pay the duty, custom and freight of the said goods and to return the overplus (if any) to this defendant. And this defendant saith that some time in November last he received a letter from the said Mr. Hope signifying that the duty or custom of the said goods was paid and that he only waited an opportunity of shipping them to Philadelphia. And this defendant saith that he hath been frequently requested by the complainants to pay them the said 2182 guilders and 76 guilders in the bill mentioned and this defendant refused so to do. But this defendant then offered to pay into the hands of the elders or church wardens of both the sd. congregations of Phila. and Skippack, who, this defendant apprehends, are the only persons who can give this defendant a legal discharge for the same, all sum or sums of money which on a fair account to be settled between them should be found due or in this defendant's hands, for the use of the said congregations, reasonable deductions being made for the expense, time, and trouble of the aforesaid voyage, according to their agreement. And in order to make them easy was also willing at that time and offered them to take the above mentioned goods on this defendant's own proper account and risk, and to allow them money in lieu thereof. And this defendant saith that some of the principal members of the said congregations thought this proposal very just, but the complainants rejected it and insisted very strenuously on this defendant's paying them the whole two thousand one hundred and thirty-two guilders and seventy-six guilders in the bill mentioned, that this defendant declared he had never received so much. This defendant further saith that he was always willing to render a just and true account of all monies received by him for the use of the said congregations of Philada. and Skippack and to pay what shall be found in his hands on an account stated and reasonable deduction made for this defendant's time and trouble and expense as aforesaid, and still is ready so to do as this honourable court shall direct, but humbly hopes that as the complainants have refused the fair and generous proposals of this defendant this defendant shall not now be compelled to take the said goods on his own account, they being shipped by the direction of the said George Weitzius (alias Wei-s) with the approbation of the said Dr. Wilhelmus, for the proper account and risk of the said congregations of Philadelphia and Skippack. And this defendant saith that this defendant thought and was advised that it was not safe or agreeable to the trust in him reposed to pay what was in his hands to the complainants, they not having any right or authority to receive the same, and for that the same belonged as well to the congregation of the German reformed church at Skippack as to the congregation of the German reformed church at Philadelphia, for whose joint use and benefit this defendant received the same. And this defendant doth aver

it was so intended by the persons who paid the same. And this defendant further saith that he is credibly informed and believes he is able to prove to this honorable court that the said complainants' said bill of complaint is brought and this suit commenced and carried on without the consent and against the will of the elders or church wardens of the said German reformed church of Skipack and of the one-half of the elders or church wardens of the German reformed church of Philadelphia, and against the general consent of the members of both the said congregations, on purpose to vex and trouble this defendant and rather to put this defendant to charge and expense than for any equitable cause. And this defendant saith that he has been so far from injuring the said congregations that in all things he has constantly endeavored to promote their interest, and had advanced, lent and paid before his voyage to Holland about the sum of £150 Pensilvania currency, in order to purchase some land and build a church for the use of the said congregations, which money remains unpaid with the interest thereof to this day. And this defendant for their greater ease in repaying the same condescended to wait till the aforesaid monies so collected in Holland should arrive. And this defendant denies he now hath or hath had at any time since his return from Holland as aforesaid any design or intention to depart this province as in a petition preferred to this honorable court by the complainants has been falsely suggested. And this defendant doth deny all combination in the bill charged, without that any other matter or thing in the complainants' said bill of complaint contained material or necessary for this defendant to make answer unto, and not herein and hereby sufficiently answered unto, confessed or avoided, traversed or denied, is true to the knowledge and belief of this defendant, all which matters and things this defendant is ready to aver and prove as this honourable court shall direct, and humbly prays to be hence dismissed with his reasonable costs and charges in this behalf most wrongfully sustained.

THOS. HOPKINSON.

Quarto die Septembris, 1733.

Coram THOS. LAWRENCE.

D.

TO MR. LOGAN,

Leyden, April 20, 1739.

President of the Council, Philadelphia.

SIR: It is a month ago that I sent to Mr. Collinson some copies of the edition of your *Meletemata* and *Canones*. I hope you may find they are printed according to your intention. Your letter to Linnaeus is sent to him at Upsal, where he got the liberty to give Colleges upon the History of Plants and Animals. In my next I hope to send you the *Flora Virginica*, and if anything more of your service I shall always be found ready.

I hope you will excuse me I am so free with you that I address these next going papers to you, in hope you will be so kind to assist the gentlemen of our Synode in their proposing. You may depend that, if it is in their power, they will always be ready and very thankful.

I am Dear Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

JOH. FRED. GRONOVIVS.*

* John F. Gronovius, Junior, a celebrated botanist, died 1760.

These gentlemen having seen your Meletemata and Canones were very solicitous about your Titles, how they should be set rightly in Dutch; but because all our Collegies are a great deal inferior to your post, viz., President of the Council, etc., they concluded that your post in our Dutch answered to what we called Governor. I hope you will excuse them of that mistake, and really we have not in our language proper words for it.

F. S. Here are printed the Fundamenta Artis Docimathecae, by which every one finding a mineral in a short time can tell how rich it is, only he requires to have a few instruments. I assure you this is one of the most useful books for the public and particular for those countreys in America where you have such rich and fine cuprum caeruleum et violaceum. In a month's time it will be finished. When you desire to have it, pray let me know it in your next to Mr. Collinson.

I have translated the letter of the Deputies of the Synode in English as well as I could.

E.

HAGUE IN HOLLAND, April the 15, 1739.

SIR: It is at the instance of Dr. Gronovius that we trouble you with these, and as it is something of consequence, we hope you will do us the favor to assist us.

What here follows is grounded upon a Resolution taken by the Reverend Synode of South Holland, Anno 1738, at the Hague about the affairs of Pennsylvania, the same Synode qualifide me and some other of the ministers to be Her Deputys.

As such I pray the God of Heaven and Earth, upon whom we call as a Father in Jesus Christ by the Holy Ghost, that at his honour and by His blessings the Prosperity of the English Nation, so befriended by our Dutch, may long continue and increase, not only in the Three Kingdoms of England, Scotland, and Ireland, known under the name of Great Britaigne, but also in her other countreys, provinces and colonys, particularly Pennsylvania, where you are President of the Council.

Some years ago are come to Holland two persons belonging to our Dutch church at Philadelphia, viz.: Mr. George Michael Weiss, minister, and Jacob Reiff, elder of the Church, to collect charitys for the benefit and promoting of the Divine Service for our Fellow-Believers in Pennsylvania. These two persons did not only stay in Holland, but went also to other Countreys.

But we understood more than once, and lately in a letter of Mr. John Diemer, dated the 16th of January, 1736, that the money which they hath collected was not yet distribute by the said persons to such to whom it should belong.

Since that time is Mr. Weiss called from Philadelphia to Kats Kill, to be a minister there, but before he departed he purged himself with an oath, that of the collected money was no more received than 200 gilders, which (so as people says) were belonged to him for the expenses of his journey.

The same Weiss has also declared with an oath, that the remaining money was in the hands of Mr. Reiff. But this Mr. Reiff (as much as we know still living at Philadelphia) is so impudent, that he says that there is no more collected than 750 gilders, notwithstanding in his col-

lect-book, of which a copy is sent to us appear, that they in Holland only have collected two-thousand one hundred and thirty-two gilders, twelve stuyvers, besides the money they have collected in Germany, and particularly at Francford at the Mayn in several sums, besides a sum of 750 Hollands, as appears in the *Copia Copiae*. Above all this, there was granted to these persons to collect 600 gilders at Amsterdam, what we suppose they have done.

I don't doubt, sir, you will conclude with us that to keep back that money, given to such a good intention, is in effect a sacrilege and a church-robbery, wherefore we think we are obliged to prosecute Reiff to the utmost degree, for the money given here as a charity for the church and our people in Pennsylvania.

But, sir, we hath no one to whom we should make our addresses, till Dr. Gronovius hearing of the bad way of doing of these two persons, desired us we should make up our case, that he would send it to you. Upon instant, sir, we did not loss our time, but meet together, and take at present the liberty to present our case to you by the care of the Doctor.

I come then with my Brothers Deputys in the name of the whole Synode to desire you, you who will be so kind to interpose your authority, to oblige Mr. Reiff (whom we hear is a man who hath money) to clear his book, that he may give an account of the receipts and expenses, and that the rest of the money should be given where it belongs.

We don't doubt when you call him to you he will easily repent. But at the contrary, if Reiff should prove himself a proud fellow, we beg the favour you would be so kind to give your advice to Mr. Drostius, a minister at Bucks county, and Dr. John Diemer, to these two gentlemen, known to us as men of honor and candor we have given authority (and will give more) to prosecute Reiff in law for not performing his duty and bad way of doing, and the restitution of church-robbery, so far as he may be guilty of it, for sir, you must known, this money is not collected for the benefit of private persons or churches, but in general for all our Dutch churches in Pennsylvania. Wherefore we beg leave we may recommend our Brothers Ministers to your protection.

We don't doubt that by your interposition we may prevail, and we assure you that we never fail to remember you in our memorandums, being always ready to accept your orders, with we are, Sir,

By the orders and in the name of the deputys of the Reverend Synode of South Holland, Your most obedient humble servant,

ERNESTUS ENGELBERTUS PROBSTING,

Minister at Heusden, and one of the Deputys of the Reverend Synode.

COPIA COPIAE.

At the first side of the copy was wrote, £12.

Account of the money collected by George Michael Weiss and Jacob Reiff for the Churches in Pennsylvania:

1. Barth. Van Else, minister at Rotterdam, hath given 79 gilders, by the order of the Reformed Synode of South-Holland, meeting at Breda f. 79.
2. Alard Tiele, minister at Rotterdam, hath given the 16th of August, 1730, by order of the Rev. Synode of South-Holland, meeting anno presente 1729 at Kuylenberg " 696.12

3. J. Geelkerke hath given at the orders of the Rev. Synode of North Holland to the Deputes at Haarlem " 390.
4. The Consistory at Amsterdam (vid. the ministers and elders) hath given hath given the 19th of Octob. 1730, when John Visscher was president of the Synode " 150.
5. The Deacons of the same town have given for the same purpose the 26th of Octob. 1730, Wilh. Colvenhobe, Deacon " 600.
- N. B. Charitys of private persons in Holland :
 - A. B. hath given in ready money, the 26 Octob. 1730 " 120.
 - D. G. hath given ready money, the 2nd Nov. 1730 " 20.
 - I. E. hath given in ready money " 6.
 - G. Corve hath given in ready money, the 2nd Nov. 1730 " 40.
 - P. R. 31.

Summa, f. 2131.12

Besides this money there is collected in Germany, videlicet:

At Frankfort at the Maine

1	40
2	20
3	12
4	4
	<hr/>
	76

750 Holland Sch.

G. C. Von Asten

(This is written in high Dutch which I don't understand myself).

There is again something which we cannot discover, viz:

Franck	24
Hanau	62

Collata concordant,

ERNESTUS ENGELBERTUS PROBSTING,
Synodi Suid-Hollandiae Deputatus.

April 21, 1739.

At the other side of the copy was written :

That G. M. Weiss hath given an oath that the money was in the hands of Mr. Reiff, 3d Nov. 1735.

THOM. LAWRENCE in Philadelphia.

F.

Extract from Saur's "Pennsylvanische Beriche," Nov. 16, 1749.

Nachdem ich seit geraumer Zeit mit empfindlich und unerweislichen Anklagen sehr bin gekränket worden, wegen dem Geldt so von den Hoch-Ehrw. Synoden von Zuydt und Nord-Holland von ohngefähr 18 Jahren durch Mr. Jacob Reiff zum Nutzen der Reformirten nach Pennsylvanien ist geschickt worden, so habe ich vor nöthigerrachtet zur Rettung meiner Unschild und Ablehnung solcher Verläumdungen, gegenwärtigen Extract in öffentliche Zeitung setzen zu lassen; als welcher ein Extract oder Auszug ist von einem Zeugnis das meine Wohl-Ehrw. und liebe Amptsbrüder bei ihrer letzten Zusammenkunft, nachdem sie diese Sache untersucht, mir ertheilt haben, und folgender Massen lautet:

Wir geben Hrn. Bruder Pfarrherrn Schlatter beygefügetes Zeugnis nach unserem Gewissen und guten Vorbedacht, damit es öffentlich und jeder manniglich möchte bekannt werden, als folget:

Herr Bruder Schlatter, Pfarrherr zu Philada. und Germantown, hat in Betrachtung des Holländischen Collecten-Geldes von Jacob Reiff in 100 Spanischen Pistolen Empfang nichts anderes gethan als seine Pflicht, und was ihm ausdrücklich durch Briefe von einem Hoch-Ehrw. Synode von Zuydt-Holland verwichenen Jahr diesen Gelder halber ist überschrieben worden, welchem er dann auch gewissenhaft und getren nachgekommen, obschon Herr Schlatter ehe er diese Orders aus Holland empfangen aus Liebe zu seiner Gemeinde denen Herrn Vorstehern allhier beinahe den halben Theil davon gegeben; das er aber hoffet an hohem Ort wohl verantworten zu können. Wie wir solches klar und deutlich aus einer freiwillig an uns vorgelegten Rechnung gesehen haben; zu Urkund dessen ist von uns eigenhändig unterschrieben und bekräftigt worden.

Philadelphia, den 24ten October, 1749.

JOHN BARTH. RIEGER,
p. t. Praeses.

GEORGE MICHAEL WEISS,
p. t. Scriba.

JOHN PHILIP LEIDICH,
Falkner Schwamm.

MICHAEL SCHLATTER,
Pfr. in Philadelphia.

III.

THE ETERNAL HUMANITY AND UNIVERSAL MEDIATION OF THE CHRIST.

BY REV. WM. RUPP, D.D.

"THERE is one God, one mediator also between God and men, himself man, Christ Jesus, who gave himself a ransom for all; the testimony to be borne in its own time." 1 Tim. 2: 5, 6.

The manhood of the Christ, which is the medium of all divine activity among men, according to the teaching of the New Testament, is not merely that of a particular man among others of His kind. He is the central, the universal man, the Second or Last Adam, *ὁ ἔσχατος Ἀδάμ*, in whom the human race has its real bond of union. The human race is not merely a mass of disconnected individuals, but an organism of which Christ is the all-embracing, all-sustaining centre. Not the first, but the Second Adam is the essential Head of humanity as a moral and spiritual organism; and He, therefore, is the summing up and completion of all things in heaven and upon the earth. The evidence of modern science points to the conclusion that the human race is physically one, having sprung from a single ancestor; but even if this conclusion should hereafter be reversed, the spiritual or essential unity of the race would still be secure in the person of the last Adam; and this is the only kind of unity that is of practical importance.

But as the last Adam, the head and crown of humanity, Christ is also in one sense its beginning. "He is before all things, and in Him all things consist, or hold together." He is the *alpha* as well as the *omega* of human history. The end of any organic process, whether it be in nature or history,

must always be regarded as the organic and controlling idea of the process; just as the workman's conception of the end to be accomplished is the directing idea of the work which he performs. This proposition could only be denied on the supposition that, with the atheistic phase of the doctrine of evolution, we should deny the whole conception of ideas and final causes in the universe. If humanity be more than the mere chance-product of the blind self-evolution of an unconscious world-process, then we must recognize in the unfolding life of humanity the presence of a great governing, vitalizing idea; and this idea according to the teaching of Christianity, is the idea of the Christ. This idea, therefore, is related not only to the race as a whole but also to every single man both as the efficient and as the final cause of his being.

And, now, this Christ-idea in humanity was never at any time a mere abstraction of the divine mind. Human ideas may often be simply abstractions of thought; but divine ideas are always realities. The ideas working in nature are not mere abstract forms of thought, but forms of thought energized and quickened by the divine will into some sort of substantial existence; that is to say, forms of thought which have attained unto real being by the entrance into them of something of the divine personality itself. So then, the creative, organic idea in humanity—the idea which lies at the root of every man's being, determining both his own peculiar nature and his relations to the whole, must be an essential form or subsistence of the divine personality itself, or in other words, a divine person. And this divine person is the eternal Christ, or the Logos of St. John's Gospel; of the thought of which the *Sophia* of the books of Proverbs and of Wisdom was a vague anticipation and prophecy.

According to St. John, the Logos, who is Himself God and yet distinct from God, is the mediator of every divine creation. "All things were made through Him (*δι' αὐτοῦ*), and without Him (or apart from Him, *χωρὶς αὐτοῦ*) was not one thing made." The material universe, accordingly, has the ground of its being

in Him; and He is the almighty bearer of all existing things—or that Word of divine power by which God beareth all things (Heb. 1: 3). To men He stands in the relation not merely of creator, and life-giver, but also of illuminator. "In Him was life, and the life was the light of men." The life which is in the Logos is not only the source of the being and physical animation of men, but in an especial manner the source of the light which shines in their reason and conscience. The reason and conscience of men—that which makes them men in distinction from brutes, persons in distinction from things—the reason and conscience are a light kindled and fed by the light of the eternal Logos, or Christ. This is the teaching of St. John; and this teaching was strongly emphasized by some of the early fathers, Justin Martyr, for example, and Clement of Alexandria, and Origen. According to the teaching of these men the heathen, even in pre-Christian times, were in some real way related to Christ; and whatever truth there was in their thoughts and good in their actions was supposed to have had its origin in this relation. Justin Martyr holds that all races of men in the past were partakers of the Word, or Christ; and that "those who lived agreeably to the Word (or reason *μετὰ λόγου*) were Christians, although they may have been thought atheists," like Socrates and Heraclitus.

But is it proper in this way to refer directly to *Christ* what, according to the scholastic Christology, could be true only of the pre-incarnate Logos, the *λόγος ἀσάρκος*, in distinction from the *λόγος ἑνσάρκος*? Granted that all men, of all times and places, stand in some essential relation to the eternal creative Logos, does this imply that they are in any essential relation to Christ, or that in any sense the man Christ Jesus is the mediator of real divine life and grace to all men? The answer which we shall give to this question will depend upon our conception of the relation between the eternal Divine Logos and the man Christ Jesus. Is this relation an eternal and necessary, or merely a temporary and accidental relation? Is the being of Christ something essentially different from the being of the eternal Logos? "The Word became flesh"—ὁ λόγος σὰρξ

ἐγένετο. The term *flesh* here doubtless stands for the conception of *manhood*. The proposition means that the Word became man. But does this imply that the Divine Word or Logos became something essentially other than He was before? If so, then what becomes of the immutability of the divine nature? God is unchangeable. St. James declares that in the Father of lights there is no variation or shadow of turning; and this we suppose to be true of the whole Godhead, and not merely of one subsistence therein. This may not mean that there can be no movement of life in the divine being, no change of states, no temporal unfolding of eternal possibilities. But we presume that it does mean that God can not become something essentially other than He is. He can not become any thing for which there is no aptitude or predetermination in His eternal being.

When, therefore, the Logos becomes man, He does not become anything that previously was foreign to His nature. On the contrary, the state of being man must be an eternal disposition or mode of being in the Divine Logos. Godhood and manhood are, therefore, not contradictory entities, mutually incompatible, and capable of existing only side by side of each other; but they must be conceived as ideally and essentially one in the constitution of the Eternal Logos, who in the fullness of time became incarnate and was made man. And this becoming incarnate was a *temporal act* only as viewed from our present human standpoint. As viewed from the divine standpoint it is an *eternal act*—an act that is wholly above and apart from time. The category of time has no application to God as God. There is in Him no *before* and no *after*. He can enter into time, indeed, and unfold His being and attributes in historical conditions; but such entrance into time must itself be a timeless act on the part of God, by which His own being is not essentially changed; and such possibility of entering into time implies, moreover, that this form of existence is an original mode in the eternal being of God. Applying this reasoning to the incarnation, it follows that the historical human Christ is but the temporal manifestation of an eternal ideal Christ; and that the

eternal ideal Christ and the temporal human Christ are not two, but one Christ: one—to use the language of the Athanasian Creed—"not by conversion of the Godhead into flesh, but by assumption of the manhood into God;" which assumption, however, it must be borne in mind, would not have been possible but for the existence of the ideal manhood in God as the archetype and ground of all actual manhood in time.

This conception of the eternal ideal humanity of Christ will serve, in the first place, as an explanation—so far as any explanation is possible—of the constitution of Christ's person; and, secondly, of the relation to each other of the attributes of the divine and human natures which co-exist in Him. The difficulty in the doctrine of the incarnation is to hold fast the idea of the unity of person along with that of the duality of natures. The union of the divine and human natures, each in its wholeness, would seem to imply the union of two persons in one; which is an impossible conception. This difficulty theologians, from the time of John of Damascus, have sought to remove by asserting the impersonality of Christ's human nature. The Divine Logos, it has been said, is the person-forming factor in the being of Christ; while the human nature which He assumed is anhypostatic, or impersonal.* Against this view the objection has usually been urged that personality is necessary to the integrity of human nature; and an impersonal human nature

* Concerning the manner in which the Logos became the person of Christ different views have been held. One view is that the Logos, continuing to exist in the absolute form of deity, simply assumed a human body in the womb of the virgin. According to this view Jesus, whose real self was the Divine Logos, possessed from the beginning all the attributes of divinity, but ordinarily concealed them during His earthly life. This makes the human life of Jesus unreal. Another view is that the Logos divested Himself of the divine attributes, and reduced Himself to the capacity of an unconscious human soul-germ, from which point He then developed Himself in true human fashion. This view is in conflict with a proper conception of deity. The reduction of one person of the Trinity to a state of unconsciousness, by which He would become *virtually* non-existent, would leave a gap in the Trinity. It is necessary to conceive of the incarnation in such way that the proper divine being of the Logos and the human consciousness of Jesus may both be maintained.

would be human nature devoid of its most distinguishing characteristic. The validity of this objection must be admitted as against the ordinary form of the doctrine to which it is opposed. Human nature in its completeness cannot be represented as impersonal. But what is it that makes human nature personal? Or rather, what is it that makes the human individual a person? It is the personality of the creative Divine Logos, by whose action in humanity, conditioned by the natural process of generation, a physico-psychical basis is produced, out of which the proper human self or person, with all its mental and moral qualities, raises itself by its own spontaneous effort. The developed personality can contain no more than is originally involved, in the way of potentiality, in the physico-psychical basis or germ; and that germ cannot have its origin in impersonal matter, or in nothing (*nihilo*), but only in the life of the personal creative Logos. The Logos, therefore, is in a most real sense the root of every human person; and every human person is, consequently, a relative manifestation, or *resounding* (*personare*) of the creative Logos in human nature.*

It follows, accordingly, that human nature universally possesses the quality of personality only in consequence of its relation to the Divine Logos; and that the humanity of Christ is, therefore, in this respect not wholly singular. The Logos is the person-forming factor in the constitution of Christ's being, but in a way that finds some analogy at least in the constitution of every human being. Through an extraordinary creative agency of the Divine Logos at a certain point in the life of humanity a physico-psychical being is produced, from which there arises a personality that is progressively one with the personality

* The above is not intended to be a denial of the commonly received etymology of the word *person*. We know that *persona* in Latin meant the mask used by an actor on the stage. But the word was applied also in common life to denote the *part* or *character* which one sustains in the world—a character determined by the world's ruling Mind, and through which that Mind comes to some degrees of manifestation. The conception of the world's universal harmony in some measure sounds through (*personal*) each one of the innumerable individuals which make up its totality.

of the Logos. This is the personality of Jesus, who, therefore, is the Son of God in a pre-eminent sense that applies to Him alone. He is like unto His brethren, and yet so much greater than they, that He is an entirely unique man, and that His being somehow embraces and bears the being of all other men. He differs from other men in this, that in Him dwells all the *fullness* of the Godhead bodily (Col. 2:9)—a statement, however, which refers to His eternal glorified state, and need not be taken to mean that Jesus during the days of His flesh was an *exhaustive* embodiment of the divine personality that appeared in Him. The humanity of Jesus became an adequate medium for the full representation of the Divine only through His glorification; and *now* the divine being, which resounds faintly and imperfectly in the person of every man, resounds perfectly in the person of Christ. And in this self-utterance in human form the Divine suffers no violence, because it takes place in accordance with an eternal law of the divine being. The real Christ is the manifestation in time of the eternal ideal Christ; and these are one.

But this conception of the oneness of the real Christ with the eternal or ideal Christ in the divine being enables us also best to understand the relation to each other of the attributes of the divine and human natures in His person. On the supposition that, in becoming man, the Logos became something essentially other than He was before, or that the human nature which He assumed was something absolutely foreign to the nature in which He existed before, it is impossible to conceive of the incarnation without doing violence to either nature concerned. In the Chalcedonian creed we are taught that the union of the divine and human natures in the constitution of Christ was effected without the loss of the peculiar properties of either. The divine and human natures exist in Him *συνῆχθως, ἀτρέπτως, ἀδιαπέρως, ἀχωρίστως*. But this conception is possible only on the supposition that these two natures, as they are united in Christ, are not heterogeneous. If the human nature were something absolutely other than the divine, then they might be

made to stand aside of each other, according to the Nestorian, or to be mixed together, according to the Eutychian scheme of thought; but they could not, without confusion or change, and without separation or division, be united in the constitution of one person. The doctrine of a *communicatio idiomatum* of the two natures in Christ must ever lead to a grotesque conception of Christ, so long as these two natures are supposed to be in their own essence contradictory.

The view here presented of the ideal existence of Christ in eternity, with which the existence of the real Christ in time is essentially one, enables us to understand those statements of Scripture in which affirmations are made concerning the real or historical Christ, which, on the traditional view, seem to be true only of the pre-incarnate Logos.* Thus it is said of the Lord Jesus Christ (1 Cor. 8: 6) that "through Him are all things, and we through Him." Compare also Rom. 11: 36, though in this last passage the immediate subject in the mind of the apostle may have been the Jehovah of the Old Testament, with whom, however, Jesus is often directly identified. But in Col. 1 it is declared of the historical Son of God, in whom we have redemption, that He is the "first-born of every creation" (v. 15), that "in Him all things were created" (v. 16), that "all things were created through Him and for Him," that "He is before all things, and in Him all things consist, and the same is the head of the body, the Church" (v. 18). The subject through this whole passage is the same, namely, the real historical Son of God. So again in Phil. 2: 5-11, it is said of Christ Jesus, who

* It should not be forgotten that the temporal preposition *pre* is applicable to the incarnation only as viewed from the finite human standpoint. As viewed from this standpoint the incarnation occurs in time, and is preceded and followed by other moments of time. As viewed from the divine side it is above time, and there is in relation to it no *before* and no *after*. The divine act of incarnation is an eternal or timeless act; and for the divine being itself (though not necessarily also for the divine *thinking*) the incarnation must be a timeless fact. But the result of this act in the human world, and for human apprehension, comes under the category of time. It has been our effort thus far in this paper to contemplate the timeless act and the temporal results as opposite sides of one indivisible reality.

is here set forth as an example of humility to believers, that being in the form of God, He counted it not a prize to be on an equality with God, but emptied Himself, taking the form of a servant and beginning to exist in the likeness of men. And, finally, it is the actual Christ in whom believers are said to have been chosen before the foundation of the world (Eph. 1 : 4). Of these passages it is sometimes said that what the apostle here predicates of the actual Christ, he meant merely of the pre-incarnate or un-incarnate Logos. The apostle, accordingly, did not succeed in saying what he meant to say. We do not consider this to be a tenable explanation. If this distinction had been in the mind of the apostle at all, we believe that he would have been quite competent to express it. Others, again, in the passages referred to explain the term Christ merely to signify the "idea" of Christ. This explanation must be rejected, if by idea is understood merely an abstraction of the divine mind; in which case it would amount to no more than the Alexandrian notion of the divine *Sophia*, as we have it in the books of Proverbs and of Wisdom. This is the Socinian explanation of the passages under consideration. If, however, by the idea of Christ, or the Christ-idea, we understand that eternal subsistence in the divine being which is, on the one hand, the archetype and bearer of the world-idea as a whole, with the possibility of all finite ideas embraced therein, and which, on the other hand, involves in its essential constitution the eternal and necessary predetermination of manhood; then we may admit that the Christ, "in whom all things were made," who "is before Abraham," and in whom believers "were chosen before the foundation of the world," is indeed the idea of Christ.

But if the idea of Christ is thus an eternal predetermination in the divine essence, of which the historical Christ is but the temporal manifestation, then it follows that this manifestation could not have been conditioned as a reality by any accidental circumstance in the history of the world. The incarnation, then, was not called for simply by the fact of sin, but would have come to pass even if there had never been any sin. The oppo-

site view would be tenable only on the supposition that sin is not the consequence of human self-determination or freedom, but of an absolute, eternal divine decree, making it a necessity in the history of humanity; in which case, however, it would involve for man no responsibility or guilt. The incarnation has its ground of necessity in the essential nature of God, and in the essential nature of the world as determined by the eternal will of God. And quite apart from sin, therefore, the man Christ Jesus is the mediator between God and men. The fact of sin, indeed, modifies the manner in which He exercises the office of mediator, but it does not create that office. That office has its ground in the fact of the creation itself, and is exercised in behalf of man as man. All men are constitutionally related to God in Christ, and without Christ they sustain no relationship to God at all. The incarnation, accordingly, is a fact which directly affects the life and being of every man. Christ has "tasted death for every one" (Heb. 2: 9). "He is the head of every man" (1 Cor. 11: 3). This last passage should, perhaps, not be pressed, as the apostle is here speaking of man in distinction from woman; but when the same apostle declares that God "gave Him to be head over all things to the Church, which is His body," this implies that, while He is, indeed, more to the Church than to men outside of the Church, He yet in some sense at least stands to all things in the relation of headship. And this idea of universal headship is distinctly implied in the designation of Him as the Last Adam.

But has not this constitutional relation of humanity to the eternal Christ been dissolved by the occurrence of sin? This is affirmed by many. The fall, it is said, involved a total separation of man from God; and the immediate consequence of this separation was spiritual death, which is now the natural condition of all men, involving absolute and total disability in spiritual things. However it may have been before the fall, after this event at least men are not essentially related to Christ at all. - The old race of Adam is totally depraved. The individuals of this race possess no longer any moral and relig-

fous ability whatever; nor are they in any sense objects of the divine love. They are not children of God, but children of the devil, and children of wrath. The statement of Christ concerning those malignant Jews who sought to kill Him, "Ye are of a father who is the devil" (John 8: 44), which in its original connection was meant merely to be a contradiction of their claim to be children of Abraham, is applied to all men as they are by nature, and is supposed to mean that there is in men, as thus considered, no longer any root or trace of divinity. And so also Paul's strong Hebraism, "by nature children of wrath" (Eph. 2: 3), originally intended to designate a moral condition resulting from deliberate and persistent indulgence of the impulses of the lower sensual nature, is supposed to be a description of the condition of every human individual previous to all moral development. The race of men, according to this view, the Adamic race, is totally sundered from God, totally depraved, totally dead in sin, the object of divine wrath, and under sentence of eternal damnation. With this race the Christ is supposed to be in no contact at all. The designation of Christ as the Last Adam, or the Second Man, is simply supposed to mean that He is the originator of a new race, as the first Adam was the originator of the sinful race; there being only this difference, that the members of the new race are none other than the members of the old race, re-born, re-created, and made new. With these latter only Christ stands in vital relation, for these only He has made atonement; and beyond the circle of these He exercises no saving influence or power.

This view, though under the mighty influence of Augustine it was long ago regarded as the only orthodox view, is now happily left behind by the more advanced Christological theology of to-day. It is the special merit of this theology that it makes Christ central not merely in Christian thinking, but also in the actual constitution of humanity. It is bound, therefore, to affirm that men's essential relation to the Christ is original, constitutional and permanent. This relation could be disturbed and obscured by the entrance of sin; but it could not be anni-

hilated without annihilating man himself. The fact of sin as a morally perverting force in human nature must, indeed, be admitted by all. This fact is too manifest to be denied. It is a matter of daily experience. Before the infant soul has attained to self-consciousness, before the personal will has been formed, there are evidences of a perverse moral tendency. This tendency must, accordingly, be hereditary in human nature, and must be propagated by generation. And in consequence of this tendency no man, except the Man Christ Jesus, has ever been free from actual sin. "There is none righteous, not one, there is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh out God, they have all turned aside, they have together become unprofitable." Rom. 3: 10.

But there is a limit to the extent and action of this perverse moral tendency. There are in human nature counter-tendencies, serving as a check to the evil, and manifesting the presence of an incorruptible moral power. And so the same Apostle who adopts the language just quoted concerning the depravity of human nature, also writes that "when the Gentiles, who have no (written) law, do by nature the things of the law, these, having no law, are a law unto themselves; in that they show the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience bearing witness therewith, and their thoughts one with another accusing or else excusing them" (Rom. 2: 14, 15). There is in the human soul the law of reason and the office of conscience, which serve as a check to the unlimited extension and prevalence of evil. There is a sense of God in all men, which gives rise to religious ideas and exercises. And there are, therefore, in heathen religions and in heathen morality true divine elements, which serve to prevent the unbounded prevalence of evil and the total corruption of human nature.

But this law in human nature, "which makes for righteousness"—what is it, and whence is it? It is the light of the eternal Christ shining in the darkness; and shining in spite of the tendency of that darkness to suppress it. And this light of the Christ lighteth every man that cometh into the world, not

only in Judea, but also in Greece and Rome, in India and China; shining, indeed, with various degrees of brightness according to the purity or impurity of the surrounding medium, but giving everywhere essentially the same color. It is the Christ immanent in human nature, or it is the essential vital relation of the soul to Christ, that preserves men everywhere from sinking into utter and total moral ruin, keeping alive, in some measure at least, the law of the reason, the power of the conscience, and the freedom of the will, which form a part of the divine constitution of humanity. Pelagius, therefore, was right when he asserted that there is in man some real moral ability, some ability for good; but he was wrong in supposing that this moral ability resides in human nature considered apart from its constitutional relation to God in Christ. Pelagius regarded the natural man as standing in no real relation of grace to Christ. He did not realize the truth that man is created and has his being in Christ, and that this is an indissoluble relationship, at least so long as man remains man. In this respect Pelagius was in error. But this error has prevailed in Augustinianism, and Calvinism and Lutheranism no less than in Pelagianism. For here, too, humanity, instead of being regarded as constitutionally in Christ, and as being consequently pervaded by gracious forces preserving it from total ruin, is regarded as a mere *massa perditionis*, from which individuals only are rescued by the exercise of an omnipotent power brought to bear upon them in an outward way through the means of grace.

The doctrine of a limited atonement is the most natural outcome of this Christless conception of humanity. If humanity be a mere mass of perdition, every member of which is under sentence of damnation until he is brought, either by baptism or conversion, into a state of grace, then it would be a contradiction to say that the atonement involves mankind universally in its design and scope. In that case the atonement is only for those who are going to be saved; and these are most naturally regarded as "a definite number particularly designed" from the

beginning; although the case would not be essentially changed by supposing the number to be indefinite, and their participation in the benefits of the atonement to be dependent upon their own choice. But we should then be confronted with the difficulty of explaining this choice; for how the members or parts of a mass of perdition, wholly dead in a moral and spiritual regard, should of themselves be able to make any good choice, is a thing totally inexplicable. If, conversely, we understand the atonement to be, not a mere legal fiction, but an actual eternal redemption wrought in humanity, and if we consider this redemption to be not limited to an elect number, but to be universal, then we must allow every man to be in some sense at least in a state of grace. And then we can understand also that "where sin abounded, grace did abound more exceedingly: that, as sin reigned in death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord" (Rom. 5: 20, 21). That means, as we take it, that, while humanity is in a state of sin and death, it is also at the same time in a state of grace and life; while through the first Adam it is a fallen race, it is through the Second Adam a redeemed race. It is a redeemed race; it is not merely a race waiting to be redeemed, or going to be redeemed. The redemption, formally accomplished in time, is in fact an *eternal* redemption, *αἰώνια λύτρωσις* (Heb. 9: 12). Christ is the author of *eternal* salvation, *αἰτιος σωτηρίας αἰωνίου* (Heb. 5: 9); and the covenant established in His blood is an *eternal* covenant, *διαθήκη αἰώνιος* (Heb. 13: 20). The predicate *eternal* in these passages indicates that the subjects to which it belongs are essentially free from the limitations of time.* And in accordance with this conception St. John describes Christ, the author of the

* We suppose the word *αἰώνιος* here to be used for the idea of *eternal* in the strict philosophical sense. But we are far from regarding this as the exclusive sense of the word in the New Testament. And we would add that we know of nothing more mischievous in Biblical exegesis than the habit of forcing the meaning which a word may have in one passage upon the same word in all, without regard to author or context.

book of life, as a Lamb slain from the foundation of the world, ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου (Rev. 13: 8).

It appears, then, that those theologians have not been mistaken, who, like Clement of Alexandria and Origen, in ancient, and Erskine, Robertson, and Maurice, in modern times, have emphasized the idea of an indissoluble essential relation of all men to God in Christ—a relation, obscured indeed, but not broken by sin, and involving in itself the possibility and principle of salvation from sin. Man as man is the child of God—a fallen, sinful, erring child, indeed, but still a child—and this relationship holds in and through the eternal Christ. The eternal Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the organic Head of humanity, is in Christ and for Christ's sake the God and Father of all men. And this is a relationship that can never be wholly forgotten by men themselves. Even in the darkest night of heathenism men have a feeling of their noble origin and relationship. They can never wholly forget that they have a divine Father who loves them and cares for them. Long before the time of St. Paul, two Greek poets, Aratus and Cleanthes, gave expression to the thought that all men are a divine offspring, or race (γένος). But it must never be forgotten that this divine relationship of men has its absolute ground in the eternal mediation of the Man Christ Jesus. If there were no Christ, then man would not be the child of God; and what is more, there would then be no man at all, for man is made through Christ, in Christ, and for Christ. And in Christ man is essentially and constitutionally a child of God; and the attainment of full salvation, or of the blessedness that belongs to the children of God, is but the personal, subjective realization of this universal, objective relationship. The difference between the actual believing Christian and one who is not a Christian consists in this, that the former has realized in his self-conscious life and being the objective possibilities involved in his constitutional relation to God in Christ, or in his eternal election in Christ; while the latter has failed thus to realize his divine destiny, which failure of itself involves the torment of hell.

But this realization of the possibilities involved in the divine constitution of a human being is not a spontaneous or natural, but a moral and spiritual process. And in this respect it is true, as Tertullian said, that a Christian is not born, but made. But in order to become Christian it is necessary that the soul should come into a direct moral or personal relation to Christ; and in order to this it is required that the Christ be presented outwardly by means of the Gospel, and inwardly through the Spirit. The testimony of the mediatorial life and activity of Christ must be borne to the soul in due time; but in order to a direct personal union, such as is implied in the process of salvation, Christ Himself in His mediatorial character must come to be immediately present to the soul in a spiritual form. In other words, Christ's essential mediation must become a mediation in the Spirit, and the essential relation between Him and the soul must be transformed into a spiritual relation. This corresponds with the New Testament teaching concerning the office and work of the Holy Spirit.* According to this teaching the Holy Spirit is the medium through which the saving, life-giving energy of Christ is brought to bear upon the spirit of man, in order to the subjective realization of the objective redemption of humanity in Christ.

The Spirit, according to the teaching of the Christian Scriptures, is the principle of self-consciousness, in God as well as in man,—the principle of actual personality. As the spirit which is in man knows the things of the man, τὰ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, so the Spirit of God knows the things of God, τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ (1 Cor. 2: 11). Spirit in general may accordingly be defined as

* According to Origen all *creatures* participate in God the Father, from whose operation they receive their being and life; all men participate in God the Son, from whose operation, as that of the eternal Word, they receive their reason and will, which constitutes their essence as moral and responsible beings; but only the *saints* participate in the Holy Spirit, through whose operation their essential moral constitution is developed into actual moral being. This view may be accepted, provided we add that all these operations must be supposed to proceed through the center of all divine activities in relation to the world, which is the Divine Logos. See Origen De Principiis I. III.

the identity of subject and object, or of thought and existence. By virtue of its spiritual nature the human soul apprehends its own determinations and states; it has apperceptions of itself, and in these apperceptions it is revealed to itself. So God is revealed to Himself in the Spirit. In the Spirit the divine being, or essence, is transparent to itself. In the Logos the divine essence objectifies, images and expresses itself; in the Spirit the same essence apperceives itself, looks through itself in that objective image, and thus knows itself. The Spirit, accordingly, is the absolute identity of subject and object in God. And these three factors in the eternal essence of God—subject, object, and identity of both—are three distinct subsistences (*subsistentiæ*, *ὁμοούσιος*), which in theology have been called persons,—Father, Son and Holy Spirit.*

* The doctrine of the Divine Trinity was foreshadowed in the later literature of the Jews. The conceptions of the Divine Wisdom (*σοφία*, also called *λόγος*) and of the Divine Spirit (*πνεῦμα*) were anticipations of the New Testament ideas of the Eternal Son and of the Holy Spirit. The description of the *Sophia* in the *Wisdom of Solomon* is especially interesting. She was present with God when He made the world, being the assessor (*παρθένος*) of His throne (9: 4), and the contriver (*τεχνίτις*) of all things. She is a pure effluence (*ἀκρόποια*) from the glory of the Almighty, the brightness (*ἀπαύλασμα*) of eternal light, the unpotted mirror (*ἀσκήρυον*) of God's energy, and the image (*εἰκὼν*) of His goodness. She gives to men immortality; and this consists in being related to her (8: 13, 17). While she is herself spirit, and while there is an intelligent, holy and only-begotten spirit within her (7: 22), she is yet distinct from the Holy Spirit; for in 9: 17 a *πνεῦμα ἄγιον* is mentioned beside the *σοφία*. These conceptions did not originally denote distinct hypostases. They were only intended as personifications. The conception of the Divine Wisdom probably meant no more than the idea of the divine goodness, intelligence and power, expressed in the natural and moral creation, and constituting the law of moral action for intelligent creatures, obedience to which forms an indispensable condition of happiness. What is wanted to make this conception equal to St. John's conception of the Logos is to suppose the attributes represented to be contained in a self-conscious centre or self, distinct from one or more similar centres in the divine Being. This may be a difficult thought to conceive; but, on the other hand, the thought of God as an abstract unit is difficult too. God must be conceived as an infinitude of living forces in eternal circulation from one centre or point in His being to another; which, however, must not be understood in a local sense. The number of these points must be at least three; for if there were

The Spirit, however, is the revealer of God, not only to God Himself, but also to all other selves outside of God. But in this revealing activity the Spirit acts not independently or separately from the other subsistences in the Godhead, but in union with them. For these subsistences are not three Gods, but three determinations or modes of one divine being. The Spirit, moreover, can only subjectively reveal God, that is to say, bring God into the consciousness of the finite spirit, in as far as there has been an objective expression of God through the Divine Word. And as this objective expression, or manifestation of God, came to its completion only through the glorification of Christ, it follows that there could be no complete revelation of God and no full performance of the functions of the Spirit in our human world previous to that glorification. St. John, therefore, goes so far, on a certain occasion, as to say that "there was as yet no Spirit, because Jesus was not yet glorified" (John 7: 39). The complete activity of the Holy Spirit became possible only after the ethical completion of the person of Christ, or after the complete historical expression of the divine being and character in human nature. The Spirit, therefore, could only come after Christ was glorified. "If I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I go, I will send him unto you."

But, as we have already seen, the historical coming of Christ was not an event that had no connection with the eternal nature of the Deity, or with the previous constitution of humanity. Essentially the manhood of Christ is eternal; and this eternal manhood of Christ is the archetype and root of the essential constitution of humanity. Hence it is that man is the image of God. There was, therefore, in humanity from

less, the divine Being would not be a closed being; and if there were more, some would be mere repetitions of others. These points may be called persons, not in the sense of individuality, but in the sense of being self-conscious centres of life in the divine Being, each positing and being posited by the rest. And in this sense the Logos and the Pneuma are as much persons as is the Father.

the beginning an essential expression of the Eternal Word; and in so far there was the possibility also of a revealing, completing, perfecting activity of the Holy Spirit among men. We, accordingly, find traces of such an activity of the Spirit everywhere in the Old Testament; although there is in the Old Testament, of course, no recognition of the personality of the Spirit any more than of that of the Divine Word. This activity is represented as taking place both in nature and in history, especially the history of the chosen people. In the natural creation the Spirit is regarded as the principle of *entelechy*, that by which the possibilities or germs of being are brought into the condition of actuality corresponding to their ideal conceptions. In the beginning the Spirit of God was brooding upon the face of the waters, as if to develop into actuality the seeds of existence slumbering in the earth's primordial elements. Then the same Spirit was in the prophets. "He spake by the prophets." And this inspiration had its ground and condition in the essential Christ-idea in humanity;—for if Christ had not been coming in humanity, there could have been no inspiration,—and its end and result it had in the historical manifestation of the Christ. Essentially and potentially Christ was in humanity from the beginning, and the formal actualization of the Christ in history, like the formal actualization of life-germs in nature, came to pass through the agency of the Holy Spirit.* Christ was conceived by the Holy Spirit; He was filled with the Spirit; He offered Himself in the eternal Spirit; and having been put to death, He was quickened in the Spirit.

* In this sense we hold the doctrine of evolution. The world is not the product of an instantaneous act of creation, but of a long process of development and growth. This applies to the mental and moral, as well as to the material world. Christianity, too, is a product of evolution. But the process of evolution, which obeys one law throughout the universe, has its principle in the triune God. It has its origin in the love and power of the Father, its ideal determinations in the wisdom of the immanent Divine Word, and its tendency to perfection in the energy of the omnipresent Spirit. It is, therefore, not a blind, irrational process, but one that is illuminated throughout by the ideas and ends of Reason.

And, now, the moral realization of the Christ in the individual human soul, that is to say, the appropriation of His character by means of personal union with Him, is brought to pass likewise through the agency of the Holy Spirit. According to a fundamental law of the divine being and manifestation, we come to *know* Christ only through the Holy Spirit. "No man can say, Jesus is Lord, but in the Holy Spirit." 1 Cor. 2: 3. The Spirit glorifies Christ by making Him manifest in the consciousness of the believer. "He shall take of mine, and declare it unto you." And this manifestation of the things of Christ is at once a manifestation of the entire Godhead with all its riches and gifts. "All things whatsoever the Father hath are mine: therefore said I, that he shall take of mine, and shall declare it unto you." And such knowledge of God in Christ, according to Christ's own declaration, is the essence of eternal life, or salvation. "This is eternal life, that they should know thee the only true God, and Him whom thou didst send, Jesus Christ," John 17: 8. We should not be surprised at this connection of eternal life with the knowledge of God; for such knowledge implies not only constitutional kinship with God, but also moral likeness. Only they who are good can know the good; and only they who are morally like God can know God. Salvation, then, means essentially the realization of moral likeness to God, or the actualization of the divine image in the human soul.

In order to salvation it is not enough, therefore, that men are essentially or constitutionally related to Christ—that their rational and moral nature has in Him its indestructible root. They must come to be spiritually related to Him. They must come to know Him; which implies personal communion and moral assimilation. That which is involved, in the form of potentiality, in the root of their being, must be actualized in their self-conscious life. Without this, men's actual condition would be in conflict with their essential being and design; and such a condition has torment. "As a king's son could not profit by his royal descent, or live a royal life, if he were ignorant of his royal

origin; so a human soul would not be saved merely in consequence of its divine origin and relationship. In order to this it must know Christ—it must know and feel itself in conscious personal relation to Him. The prodigal must “come to himself,” and in his inmost self realize the relation of sonship which is his, before the fact that in his father’s house there is bread can do him any good. And so the sinner must realize in himself, in his knowledge and will, the fact of his constitutional divine relationship, in order that this may be for him the blessing which it is designed to be. And this realization is not a spontaneous, but a moral process—a process accomplished through the reason, and feeling, and will of the subject—conditioned by the outward ministration of the Gospel—the testimony of Christ—and the inward ministration or operation of the Spirit, which imparts to the truth of the Gospel its self-authenticating, its convincing, and vitalizing energy.* There is, doubtless, a gracious activity of the Spirit exerted in humanity everywhere. The constitutional relation of men to God in Christ offers a natural basis for such an activity. But that this is not sufficient for salvation is evident both from Scripture and from the moral character everywhere presented by the heathen world. According to St. Peter (Acts 4: 12) the *name* of Christ, that is, the historical revelation of Christ, is the indispensable condition of salvation. And the actual life of the heathen world, while it presents true moral and spiritual

*Formerly much stress was laid upon the testimony of the Holy Spirit as authenticating the truth of the Gospel. This idea has largely become obsolete to the modern mind. It is worthy, however, of being restored. But in order to this there is needed a new interpretation of it. Essentially the testimony of the Holy Spirit means nothing more than the self-authenticating power of divine truth. Divine truth is not an abstraction—a thing separated from the divine mind. Divine truth is the product of the divine thinking, or more accurately, it is the divine thinking itself—the very exercise of the divine mind. Hence to come in contact with divine truth is to come into immediate contact with the divine mind or Spirit itself; and this is what gives that truth its convincing, its living and quickening power; although this power can only be felt by a mind that is in essential and moral harmony with the divine.

elements—the light shining in the darkness—is yet no where really spiritual or Christian, but carnal and sinful.

We conclude, therefore, that they are in error who hold that the presence of the essential Christ in human nature and the universal activity of the Holy Spirit are sufficient for salvation, even without the testimony of the Gospel. This position is sometimes assumed in order to justify the theory of the universal decisiveness of the present life in relation to the eternal destiny of men. That the whole heathen world should be eternally damned, is a thought that does not harmonize with modern conceptions of the character of God. The view is, therefore, gaining ground that many heathen will probably be saved. But if the possibility of salvation is to be restricted to the present life, then this salvation must be accomplished either wholly without Christ, according to the Pelagian doctrine, or in consequence of the universal immanence of Christ and of the Holy Spirit in humanity. The latter view is accepted by many. This we do not believe to be warranted either by Christian reason or experience. If the simple fact of the universal immanence of Christ in humanity, as the cause of the light shining in the reason and conscience, were sufficient for the salvation of individuals now, then it would seem that it should have been sufficient also for the same purpose previous to the actual occurrence of the incarnation. Yet we know, if we are to believe the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, that even the most faithful in Israel were not made perfect in respect of their salvation during the time of the Old Testament dispensation. See Heb. 11: 40. And as for the universal agency of the Holy Spirit, this, while it must be admitted to have place, and to be of moral efficacy and value, can yet not be supposed to avail more in the heathen world now, than it availed in the Jewish world previous to the glorification of Christ, when, according to St. John, there was as yet no Spirit. If, then, we make earnest of the idea of the universality of the Christian atonement, and of the universal immanence of Christ in humanity, involving the divine destination of all men to salvation; and if,

further, we hold that the universal immanence of Christ, and the universal immanence of the Holy Spirit connected therewith, are not efficient for the actual salvation of the individual; then we are bound to assume that the possibility of the actualization of salvation must reach beyond the limits of the present life, and that there must be presented to all men, before their destiny can be forever fixed, an opportunity of making a positive personal decision with reference to Christ, similar to that which is in this life presented by the Church through the Gospel.

The Church is the sphere in which Christ in the Spirit now exercises His mediatorial office among men for their salvation. The essential mediatorial relation in which He stands to all men, makes way for and completes itself in a mediation through the Spirit, through which He comes to stand to men in a direct personal relation as an object of faith and love. And this latter form of mediation is exercised through the instrumentality of the Gospel; which makes the process of salvation distinctly a moral process, answering to man's moral nature. It is just this that makes man a moral being, in distinction from all merely natural existences, that, though essentially rooted in the creative Being of God, and deriving from this the law of his life and conduct, yet this law does not in him carry itself out spontaneously, as it does, for example, in the plant or crystal; but that, while immanent in his essential spiritual constitution, it presents itself nevertheless in an outward objective form to his understanding and will as an object of free choice. And the concrete embodiment of this law is the Christ of the Gospel; who being presented to the soul through the agency of the Spirit, as an immediate object of consciousness, and accepted by it in faith and love as the personal norm of moral action, becomes for it the efficient principle or cause of the development of a true spiritual personality answerable to its divine conception. And this spiritual contact with Christ, as the condition and beginning of the formation of a spiritual or God-like character, is the regeneration or new birth of the soul. Regeneration does not consist in the infusion of a new or foreign essence into the soul

by any natural or magical process, but in the spiritual quickening of the soul under a stimulus exerted by the Holy Spirit and freely responded to by the soul itself. By an impact of the Spirit of Christ upon the soul, at the essential centre of its being, back of all consciousness, it is quickened into that spiritual life which its original constitution in Christ properly implies and demands. It is only this touch of the Spirit of Christ that brings out the soul's true nature, and without this it can, therefore, never be truly itself. In developing a Christian personality it unfolds itself according to its original idea and constitution in Christ. The Christian personality is a personality which, agreeably to the soul's original idea and design, has become morally one with the person of Christ, having by faith and love appropriated His mind and character, and thus having become a fitting subject for the reception and manifestation of the love of God, which is the end of the creation.

But here we must bring this study to a close; for more than a *study* this essay does not claim to be. It has been our aim to answer, to our own satisfaction at least, some of the fundamental questions which the age is asking concerning Christ and Christianity; and it is hoped that the answer may be of some interest also to others. The mind of this age cannot be satisfied by mere outward authority in religion any more than in science. Thoughts that are not really thinkable, propositions that violate the essential laws of logic, will no longer be generally accepted, no matter by what supposed infallible authority they may be commended. And as all questions concerning Christianity reduce themselves at last to the question, what think ye of Christ, a satisfactory answer to that question will always be a sufficient apology for Christianity. Is the thought of Christ, as given in the Christian creed, thinkable? Can the fundamental conceptions of Christianity justify themselves to the fundamental laws of thought? That the "plan of salvation" as formulated in many a past system of theology cannot thus justify itself, we are firmly convinced. But can the facts of the Gospel and the facts of the creed be so interpreted as to demonstrate their correspond-

ence with the laws of reason? Can Christianity thus be shown to satisfy not only men's feeling and conscience, but also their reason? This we firmly believe. And to this end nothing more is required than to demonstrate the correspondence of the Christ-idea itself with the necessary laws and postulates of the reason. That is the chief problem now before the theological mind; and without the solution of that problem, all disputes on minor questions, such as the inspiration and inerrancy of Scripture, would be utterly in vain. The problem is not to demonstrate the existence and character of Christ by any mere logical process based either upon reason or Scripture. To the Christian consciousness Christ authenticates Himself, and the Christian mind requires no further proof of His being and power. But the problem is to demonstrate the self-consistency of the idea of Christ in the light of the universal laws of reason; or in other words, to think through the thought of Christ, and so to demonstrate its conformity with the demands of reason. And towards the solution of that problem this paper is intended to offer a few thoughts. We do not flatter ourselves that we have solved the problem to the satisfaction of all. It is a problem on which eighteen centuries have labored; and the last word has not been spoken yet. The fact that men have thought and spoken on this subject in the past, implies that men have the right to think and speak on it still. If only this be done with more humility and charity than have at times characterized debates on this subject in the past, we may be sure that the truth will be promoted.

IV.

THE PLACE OF THE COLLEGE IN HIGHER EDUCATION.*

BY REV. H. T. SPANGLER, A.M., URSINUS COLLEGE, COLLEGEVILLE, PA.

THERE is a certain amount of education to which every human being is entitled. Every child of the race has a right to ask of its elders to be put in possession of the tools of knowledge, and to be given sufficient education to enable it to use its God-given powers with fair intelligence. The policy of this grade of educational work should be, the widest diffusion and to all the same opportunities.

Beyond this elementary training, which may be looked upon as every man's birthright, there are higher fields of knowledge, to which the human mind is irresistibly drawn, whose mastery yields the rich fruitage of liberal culture. To this grade of educational work the name of higher is applied.

The social condition of the world being such that the majority of men must devote their energies chiefly to bread-winning, and that from an early period in life, the field of higher education is entered only by limited numbers. The proportion of young men engaged in study in the colleges of the United States does not exceed fifty-one in every 100,000 of population. Higher education is, therefore, restricted in its operations, and must bring its share of blessings to the world by its

* Substance of address at educational meeting held by Eastern Synod on the evening of October 20, 1892, during its annual sessions in St. Paul's Reformed Church, Lancaster, Pa.

altitude rather than by its latitude. Its true policy is, the highest development rather than the widest diffusion.

Now, what is the place of the college in this field of higher education? Its separate existence can be justified only by the definiteness and distinctiveness of its work and mission. On the one side of it stand the secondary schools, the high school and the academy. On the other, the professional schools and the university. What is the college idea, in distinction from the aims, and purposes and methods of these other schools?

One man says: "A college is an upper preparatory school, intended to fit for the professions, or for special advanced studies. In case its graduate declines a profession, he is nevertheless fitted for a more intelligent, enjoyable life in business, or in the management of affairs."

Another defines the college as intended to give "a thorough disciplinary education of the highest grade;" whilst the object of the university is "the training of specialists in the several departments of learning, and the extension of the bounds of human knowledge."

Another says: "The college does the work between public and private schools of good grade, on the one side, and the universities on the other, serving as a connecting link between the two."

And still another, who claims that "the business of education is in effect one," whether carried forward in the primary or secondary school, in the college or university, says: "Speaking succinctly, the constituents of a sound education are, first, character; second, culture; third, critical power, including accuracy and also sympathy with all the various ages, nationalities and moods of men; and fourth, power to work hard under rule and under pressure."

Accepting the dictum that "the business of education is in effect one," it is patent that the college must have many features common to all educational institutions. Standing between the preparatory school and the professional school, it partakes of the character of both. There is propriety in calling it an

upper preparatory school, for it does not aim to do more than thoroughly discipline the student for professional or technical study, or for a higher use and enjoyment of life. There is abundant excuse, also, for the confusion that has existed between it and the university, because many colleges have allowed themselves to be driven into university work, and many so-called universities scarcely do creditable college work. There is, however, a differentiation going on in the educational forms of the day which gives promise of fixing the place of the college in the scale of institutions devoted to higher learning. The friends of education should keep in line with this differentiation, and by clearing up their own ideals seek to forward it.

The distinctiveness of the college idea, according to the notions of the best men engaged in the work, seems to lie in the fact that the college is an educational institution whose main business is to train and discipline the student. The student, in all the elements of his being, spiritual, intellectual and physical, is to be kept in the foreground. The process through which he is carried has its end in the man himself, in the development and perfecting of his whole being. President Andrews' statement of the constituents of a sound education as character, culture, critical power, and ability to work hard may be accepted as a summary of the results to be aimed at in collegiate education. A college is not intended to prepare men for a particular business or profession, but to develop, train and discipline them in the totality of their being. In doing this with singleness of aim, and by the use of the best methods and men, there may be expected a finished product that is a man, with the powers of mind and body bestowed upon him by nature awake, and disciplined and cultured, who will go forth to his chosen life work "rejoicing as a strong man to run a race." To attain a strong, well-rounded character; a culture that "relishes the beautiful in conduct, in art and literature, and in nature;" a critical power that is faultless in accuracy and broad in sympathy; and power to work hard, under the strictest self-mastery,—these are the lofty ideals which the col-

lege sets before its matriculates, and to the attainment of which every student should bend his noblest energies.

In the light of these general principles let us look at several of the factors which enter into the constitution of a college.

Of these factors the faculty is of first importance, because it is the intellectual head and center of the institution. From it power must radiate. The authority which stands back of the faculty in the constitution of a college discharges its functions best when it is rather formal than real. The board of trustees, or directors, or regents, or by whatever name it may be known, which is necessary to the organization of the institution, is most useful when it moves in accord with and in response to the intellectual head. The men engaged in the actual work and warfare of the college know best its needs, and can be trusted to indicate the best modes of supplying the same. When they cease to indicate, it is wiser for the board to remove them than to seek to make itself the seat of life and motion. A college is best governed from within.

In constituting a college faculty chief regard must be had to the ruling idea in collegiate training, viz., the development of the student. Therefore, the personality of the men who are to teach and administer the college must be given first consideration. They must themselves possess the qualities of mind and heart which are to be awakened in the student. Like begets like, life from life are laws that rule in the educational world as unerringly as in nature. Education is not produced by machinery, which the professor is to control and feed; nor by rote, with him to check off the pages of progress.

High personal and social character are requisite to an ideal college professor, because his range of duty is wider than that of instruction. The administration of the college, the discipline of the students, their social and spiritual culture, also belong to the faculty. It is a vicious idea that the chief qualification of a college professor is ability to teach a specialty; that the discipline is to be relegated to police officers; the business administration to special clerks; the religious interests of the student

to a chaplain; and their social culture to the stray acquaintances of the town. The larger the number of points at which the professors and students touch, and the more continuously they are kept in contact with each other, the better it will be for both. The professor's personality, his force of character, his social and intellectual culture, his enthusiasm, his kindness of spirit, his sincerity and love of truth, each and all are educational elements of the highest value to the student, whose benefit he will receive only by personal contact with the professor, and which are operative whether it be an item of business, a case of discipline, hours in the laboratory, or a social evening that brings them together.

The smaller colleges observe these principles more fully than the larger institutions. The size of the former renders such administration more practicable, and consequently they enjoy a great advantage over their bulky competitors. But the elimination of the personal element in administration is creeping into them also. The change is encouraged by professors who do not distinguish between the college and the university, and who ease their consciences with the theory that their responsibility is limited to the class-room. It is welcomed by some trustees in the hope that the one-sided and half-developed men in the faculties can be kept in their places, by delegating the weightier and more difficult part of a college professor's duties to a special officer. But all such expedients are vain. University methods of instruction are doubtless an improvement on many of the old college methods, but university discipline does not fit the college. The university professes to do nothing but furnish a guide for the development of the student in scholarship. The college idea is that the whole life of the student is to be developed by contact with and under the influence of a cultured superior, who stands to him in the relation of companion and friend; in *loco parentis*, in the sense of supplying a parent's experience and wisdom, with the sympathy of an elder brother.

To be in trim for the discharge of his duties, the college pro-

fessor must also keep himself in contact with the practical world of politics, and religion, and social life. He is to train young people for the activities of life, and his efforts will be theoretical and pointless unless he himself knows the world into which his younger fellow-student is soon to be introduced. The professor is not to impart to the student such general knowledge of the wider world; but his fresh knowledge of it will affect his teaching, and his interest in the student. Upon this point high ground is taken by a clear-headed New England college president, who says: "A good proportion of a college faculty should be men who have gained maturity of character through experience in the great school of life; men who have studied a profession, or interested themselves in some practical social problem, or have traveled extensively, or have edited a paper, or have delivered lectures, and at the same time have kept alive their scholarly pursuits and aims. In the college professor the man must be more than the scholar."

Whilst this puts the practical qualifications of the college professor in the foreground, it is not to be presumed that his scholarship is sufficient if it is of secondary quality. In the particular subjects he teaches the professor must be master. Not only must he know them thoroughly, but he should have a wide view of the whole field of science, literature, and philosophy, that he may not be narrow in presenting his own subjects and be able to point out the relations of knowledge. With his own department he should be so familiar that he can devote his main time and strength to skillfully setting the subject before the student, in order to awaken in him an interest in it and to lead him to its mastery. Having aroused the student's interest and enthusiasm, he can lead him on to mastery, and that will develop power. By supplying the materials and opportunities and impulse to thought and study, he will set the student about the serious business of educating himself. For after all only as the human mind reaches out and lays hold upon knowledge, will it grow and become enriched. The professor stands only in the relation of interpreter and guide; but happy the

student who is privileged to travel over the highways of knowledge under the leadership and inspiration of a seer.

Because of the difficulty of finding men possessing the qualifications desirable in a college professor, there should be provision made in connection with every college to seek out and encourage the students of promise to prepare themselves for teaching. A man picked out by a skilled superior, will enter with greater confidence upon a career of preparation than one who hears only the voice of ambition, or who follows simply his own impulse. The college professor's vocation is sufficiently high to merit a call from above. Such provision should be made, not necessarily to enable a college to raise up its own professors, but in order that each college might contribute its quota to the body of men who ought at all times to be engaged in advanced work at the universities and pedagogical schools of the country, with the view of fitting themselves for college professorships.

From the faculty we turn to the courses of study in the college. These need to have the light of the broader and more liberal ideas of the day turned upon them. Educational superstition and indifference have allowed those in control of colleges to perpetuate the ill-fitting ideas of the past, or to start off into all sorts of experiments. The times demand that the principles underlying the selections of subjects of study be re-examined, and if possible a present-day adjustment adopted. Dr. Andrews keenly remarks upon this point:

"The system of collegiate education in the Eastern States of America came mostly as the kingdom of heaven comes, without observation. While it was forming no one knew, and no one can, with any exactness or certainty, tell now whence or how it originated. Its growth was spontaneous and silent, rather than the product of deliberation and discussion. But the age of still evolution in this sphere of culture is past. In common with many other institutions and phases of our civilization, collegiate education is now emerging from an automatic into a reasoned and conscious life. All friends of education

should rejoice at the change, giving thanks to those enterprising thinkers who have in recent years done so much to rouse the administrators of our highest educational institutions from their dogmatic slumbers. Movements in the interest of educational progress must be welcomed, but they must also be keenly scrutinized. Compared with automatism, which is safe because dead, consciousness is in certain ways dangerous. Yet advance to-day requires conscious action, and we must do our best to assuage whatever friction this may occasion."

The most iconoclastic reformer of the college curriculum must admit that certain subjects, which have had a place in every scheme of liberal education from time immemorial, have proved themselves well adapted to culture. These have given to the world its educated men in the past, and doubtless will be able to accomplish the same results in the future. It does not follow, however, that because of their known and tried value these alone should have a place in the college course, and that none other can be used to attain the high ends of liberal education. As the field of knowledge enlarges, human culture deepens and broadens, and makes new demands upon the instruments of its development. Modern progress has brought forward many new problems, for the solution of which new appliances are required. These demand training in new directions, and the development of powers in man not evoked by the disciplines of the past.

Men and things comprise the whole field of knowledge. Hitherto the maxim, "The proper study of mankind is man," has held sway. Language, literature, and mathematics have furnished the staples of college study. There is, however, a growing demand for other subjects. The monopoly of the classics has been attacked, and an impression has been made upon the fortress from two directions. The sciences of nature have demanded and secured for themselves a place in the college. The practical arts, more obnoxious to the classicist than science, not having been accorded a shelter in the established schools of higher education, have called into being schools of their own,

which attract thousands of students. These schools assert that "all the essentials of intellect and character" are as fully and happily achieved through their courses of study as in the classical schools. Dr. Francis A. Walker, President of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in Boston, says that if he did not believe that the graduates of the institution over which he presides were better educated men in all which the term educated man implies, he would not consent to hold his position for another day.

With this demand for a more practical training, and a supply being provided outside of the classical and literary institutions, it has become a serious question as to what policy the college ought to pursue. There is danger of the culture, in the bosom of which the Protestant Reformation was cradled and which has always been tributary to religion, being superseded by a cult whose inspiration is not from above, and whose spirit is not congenial to Christianity. There are many signs at hand which seem to indicate that the age is really in need of a culture somewhat differentiated from the traditional type. And under these circumstances would it not be better for the colleges to take up the new that is of value, and sanctify it by an infusion of that which has been proved and hallowed by age, rather than be compelled finally to surrender the whole field, or at least a large part of it?

For a solution of the perplexities of the situation we cannot appeal to experience. The newer studies have not been on trial sufficiently long to warrant the assumption of their equality with, much less of their superiority to, the older. They do, however, give promise of bringing elements into liberal culture that are demanded by the spirit of the age. The great success of technological schools and of scientific departments in colleges plainly indicates that the old-style disciplines are not meeting the needs of the day. And if the colleges really believe in the superior worth of their training, they cannot be indifferent to the thousands of students who now pass them by and seek preparation for the higher walks of life in technical schools, without

any of the moulding influence of the classics and philosophy. To attract these men they must accommodate themselves to their wants. To save themselves and their leadership in higher education, they must bring back the tide which is steadily setting in another direction.

In addition to these practical reasons for looking into the propriety of a modification of the course of study in college, the principle upon which rests the demand for the admission of new subjects is worthy of consideration. The claim rests upon the natural difference of mental constitution which characterizes individuals, and upon the unity of the human mind. Because the mind is not an organism, whose members or faculties are developed by the study of specific subjects, it is not correct that languages are necessary to develop a certain part of it, mathematics another, and philosophy another; nor is it correct that at certain stages of mental development these several subjects are the only ones that will stimulate mental growth. The human mind is a unit and grows from within by the exercise of itself in the acquirement and elaboration of knowledge. It is this exercise of the mind that develops and strengthens it, and only when the subjects presented arouse its interest and enkindle enthusiasm will there be much mental activity. For mental development and discipline the first requisite is the thorough awakening and interested activity of the mind, and the subjects that have this effect upon the student are the proper ones for him to pursue.

If it were a question of the utility of the knowledge acquired certain subjects might be insisted upon as absolutely essential to proper mental build. But the college training is one of discipline chiefly, and of utility only secondarily. Therefore, give the student the subjects in which his keenest interest and greatest enthusiasm can be awakened, if you would develop his mind, strengthen his faculties, and build him up into vigorous intellectual manhood. After his mind has been awakened, and he becomes conscious of its power, the natural thirst for knowledge will lead him to the interested study of subjects to which

he was once indifferent, because he sees their utility in opening to him new fields of knowledge.

The lack of interest on the part of some students in subjects to which others are keenly alive can be accounted for only on the ground of difference in mental organization. Because of this difference the same subjects will not be as beneficial to one student as to another, and when we recognize the difference of treatment required for the development of different minds we are simply conforming our mental hygiene to the demands of nature.

There was a time when the notion prevailed that the same foods were equally adapted to all persons, at least to all children. Physiology has discovered that difference in organization necessitates difference in nutriment, even in healthy systems, and that the system itself can be trusted to indicate, by a sort of natural selection, the food that will best nourish it. Because of this diversity of physical organization, there has grown up a school of vegetarians who declare that they will eat no meat while the world stands. They toil, and grow fat, and become old. Neither their physical appearance nor their efficiency in the work of life indicate that they are inferior to the carnivorous feeders who affect to despise them.

So let it not be imagined that constitutional mental differences, which reveal themselves in aptitude for different studies, are owing to any defect in the quality or the power of the mind. They are natural, and must be recognized in educational schemes that would do the best for all who avail themselves of the help offered in organized courses of study.

The logical conclusion of all this reasoning is that the college cannot well establish a fixed curriculum; that the best it can do is to offer subjects adapted to culture from the whole field of knowledge, and allow each student to choose those best suited to the quality and temper of his mind. To guide the inexperience of youth, the order and affiliation of subjects and the amount of work ought to be prescribed, and the rest left to the free choice of the student and his adviser on the faculty.

The objection that only the larger and wealthier colleges could provide so wide a range of subjects in the college course, is offset by the fact that there are only two fundamental types of mind and corresponding lines of scholarly interest, the literary and the scientific. Any college can provide for the principal studies along these two lines, and allow predominance to the one or the other, and variation in the proportion of the two, according to the individual capacity and needs of the students.

The advantages that would accrue to liberal education from such an arrangement of studies are manifold. The student would work along the lines of his natural aptitudes, in which his keenest interest and greatest enthusiasm can be aroused, and consequently his mental development and training for the work of life would be the more easily and successfully accomplished. In college he would study along these lines for mental development. Afterward, choosing a profession in accord with the same general tendency and habit of mind, he would find his professional studies in line with his college work, and his earlier studies contributing largely to his success in the later. There would thus be a consistency and harmony in his work which would carry him far beyond the student who studies in one direction for mental discipline, and travels in another to prepare himself for active life. Not only would there be natural interest and accelerated development characterizing his whole student career, but throughout his professional life he would find interest and helpfulness in the studies which he commenced in college. Such continued interest would have a tendency to preserve his scholarly habits amid the drudgery of professional practice, thus maintaining for him not only the source of his highest pleasures, but also the surest means of personal advancement.

Another advantage that would flow from such an arrangement of college studies is, that higher education would be relieved from the odium of being merely a mental gymnastic. The acquirement of knowledge and the development of mind would bear some relation to future practical life. Collegiate education would not only develop the powers of the mind, but

would do it by the use of studies the knowledge of which a man will need in after life. Such a system would commend itself to all men as being scientific and reasonable. The age is not opposed to liberal education, but it asks that it be made more practical. Science and common sense unite in saying that it can be done, without depreciating the quality of the training or injuring the institutions established for its development.

Upon this point of adapting the work of the college to the demands of the times, the opinion of a friend of classical education may be appreciated, and is quoted here at some length:

"The problem, as it presents itself to many, is not, liberal education versus technical education. Practical education is the thing desired, and a practical education is not necessarily technical. The distinction is easy to perceive, but more difficult to explain. 'Practical' stands midway between 'liberal' and 'technical;' it is a happy medium and combines the qualities of both. It may, perhaps, be best made clear by the aid of concrete examples:

"A practical knowledge of Latin implies the ability to translate Latin phrases of frequent occurrence and to interpret, off-hand, unfamiliar Latin derivatives. Not every college-bred man can meet these requirements.

"A practical acquaintance with French or German means that the possessor can converse, on ordinary topics, in the language, and can read, at sight, the works of all but the most obscure native writers. Few college graduates would undertake to do either of these things.

"A practical education in chemistry provides a man with methods for the detection of common food adulterations and poisons, and prepares him to understand sanitary reforms.

"Such being the nature of a practical education, it is evident that, to meet the conditions, the present policy of the college need not undergo extensive revision. The college is not to be transformed into a technical school, nor is the present schedule of studies to be fundamentally altered. The courses must simply be made valuable from a common-sense, every day point

of view. English must train for journalism, the pulpit, and the bar, in a distinct and thorough manner not at all allied to present methods. Chemistry must solve problems in drainage, ventilation, and water supply. Physics must abound in practical lessons in mechanics. History and political economy must fit for citizenship and politics.

"And all this can be done without prejudicing liberal education a term which has too long connotted impracticality. The college should provide an education which, while it broadens the sympathies deepens the mind and liberalizes thinking. At the same time possesses a utility value. There are no contradictions in such a project for 'liberal' and 'practical' are not mutually exclusive.

"Let the college so modify its courses that the attainments of its students are more than accomplishments, and its high position in our educational system will be maintained. It will then be better able than ever before to graduate men 'whose knowledge enables them to grasp the principles of medicine, or law, or politics, or theology, to guide social progress and form public opinion,' and 'to enjoy the companionship of wise and good men of all lands and ages.'"

V.

CHRIST, THE CHIEF CORNER STONE.*

BY REV. A. J. HELLER, A. M.

Now therefore ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God: and are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone; in whom all the building fitly framed together groweth into an holy temple in the Lord: in whom ye also are builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit. Eph. 2: 19-22.

Herein are presented to us the bold outlines of the universal Christian Church. We distinctly see the few essential parts which compose its structure and can trace the relation which they sustain to each other. The corner stone, the foundation, and the superstructure of this spiritual temple are all clearly outlined. Christ is declared to be the chief corner stone; the doctrine, preaching, and lively faith of the Apostles, it will hardly be questioned, constitute the foundation; and the saints, including the Apostles themselves, compose the superstructure.

In the figure of a building, as presented in the text, Christ is declared to be the original and perpetual ground and source of the Church. In Him alone is to be found that which is essential for gathering those who are to compose its membership, building them up in righteousness and holiness of life and uniting them into one harmonious body. As is elsewhere declared: "Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God," and as He Himself prays: "that they may all be perfect in

* Sermon preached at the opening of Pittsburgh Synod Sept. 23, 1892.

one." He is accordingly the principle or source of knowledge, of power, and of unification.

Of course it will be understood that these three are not separate or independent principles, but only a threefold manifestation of the one principle, comprehending the revelation of God, namely, Christ Jesus.

If we briefly consider the manner in which the congregation to which this epistle was originally addressed was founded and cherished, we can perhaps acquire a nearly correct idea of what the Apostle means by the expression "founded on the apostles and prophets, Christ Jesus himself being the chief corner stone."

By the direction and quickening influence of the Holy Ghost, the apostles went forth, in compliance with the terms of their high commission, to preach the Gospel to every creature. To do this they utilized the knowledge and personal experience which they had acquired by direct contact with the Saviour. They proclaimed Jesus Christ and Him crucified, yea, rather risen and ascended to the right hand of the Father, as the Lord of life, and the hope of the world. They announced repentance and faith as the personal qualifications, and demanded the observance of the divinely ordained institutions of Baptism and the Lord's Supper as the means, by which men could come into saving relation with Christ and continue in His fellowship. He who responded to this proclamation was said to have been born again. This knowledge which awakened a sense of sin and need, which pointed the way and caused men to surrender themselves unreservedly to Christ was the dawning of a new life within them. It was the day spring from on high entering their souls and dispelling the spiritual darkness which had so long reigned there.

Every one feels that when men speak from the depths of their own wisdom concerning the supreme issues of life they are at best only conjecturing, or speculating. The preaching of the apostles was a heralding of the objective fact that God had unveiled Himself, had become manifest in the flesh, and that

men were indeed His offspring, whom He had come to bless. It was not a teaching of human maxims and precepts, of formulated rules for the regulation of life, which would in the end throw men back again upon their own mental and moral resources. It was in a very real sense the presentation of Christ Himself; a pointing Him out like that of John the Baptist: "Behold the Lamb of God who taketh away the sin of the world."

The next step in the process of building up those who had become fellow-members of the saints and of the household of God, was to instruct them in regard to the privileges and obligations of the Christian life, so that, in the midst of the political, social and moral conditions surrounding them, they might rightly exemplify the life of their divine Master and further the work of evangelizing the world. Christ Jesus was ever held up to their view as the mark of the prize after which they were to strive in the formation and building up of their own characters and in the shaping of their actions towards a hostile world.

There were many practical questions which pressed themselves upon the Apostles and their congregations for solution, such as the manner of celebrating the Lord's Supper and of administering the sacrament of holy Baptism, the form of church government and the multiplication of ministerial offices; for neither in the Gospels nor in the Epistles do we find that Christ gave any formal deliverance upon any of these or similar questions. They were left to the disciples to be disposed of when the time and occasion should arise. But they were fully equipped for this part of their great work. When the Saviour was about to leave them, He gave them repeated assurances of His continued presence with them to the end of time, and He also assured them that His presence should be mediated by the Holy Ghost who would *guide* them into all truth. It is this vital conjunction with God, significantly as briefly expressed in the words of the Saviour, "I in you and you in me," which lifts man up and constantly renews him, so that every soul power is

quickened and energized by the divine nature. The Holy Ghost, however, adds no new faculty to man; He reveals no new fundamental fact or institution, no other universal, all-comprehending principle, for there can be but one such. The Holy Ghost does not overpower or suspend the independent action of man's intellectual faculties so as to make him a mere passive instrument in His hands. In that case the revelation would not be historical and could not affect man in any way. Only that which enters into his life in the way of actual experience can benefit him. Man's knowledge develops in the contemplation, adaptation and application of divine truth. On the basis of what is given in the way of objective fact or principle, the mind must be allowed to follow its own processes in the development and acquisition of knowledge, so that what it has to communicate is first its own peculiar possession. The great advances made in science and the mechanic arts have been accomplished by the careful study and application of the laws governing the material elements and the various orders of life which have existed from the foundation of the world. And every new advance has been a revelation of the powers of the human intellect and of the resources of nature, and, above and beyond these, also of Him who is the author of both, is imminent in both—according to the measure of each—and works in and through them. This faintly illustrates what we mean by saying, that man is influenced by the indwelling of Christ, but that he is free to think and free to act; that it is by painful thought that he comes more and more into the light, and that the problems which constantly, through the ever changing conditions of social and intellectual life, arise and confront him, are solved.

This leaves room for progress in revelation, or the gradual unfolding of the truth presented once for all in the incarnate Son of God; which is the same as to say, for development of doctrine and Christian character. We observe such progress already in the time of the Apostles. The celebration of the holy communion is no longer allowed in connection with the

eating of a full meal. The Apostles themselves give unmistakable evidence of growth in knowledge and strength. In the forms and order of worship, church government, eleemosynary institutions, and in a thousand other ways the truth is wisely adapted to individual, political, and social relations. It accounts, too, for the gradual development of doctrines, the displacement and supersedure of ancient by modern views, for differences of modes of worship and administration in different ages and amongst widely separated peoples. The people of every age and every nation are called upon to solve for themselves the problem of their own salvation, by adapting the Gospel to their own needs. If every detail had been given ready to hand at the beginning, there would have been an end of thought, and of course also an end of life in the proper sense of that word. Then the New Testament would have been a book, or repository, of charts, of drawings and specifications, of dogmas and precepts, a sort of religious dispensatory instead of a book of life.

This is, of course, very different from the view of those who regard the Bible as the only and ultimate source of wisdom. As if God had somehow written it or secured its production without the conscious, appreciative activity of man! Of course, we do not mean to say that the Bible is not from God, but, on the contrary, we mean to affirm that it is in a far more important sense His word, than it is practically admitted to be by those who sometimes laud it very highly, only to use it for bolstering pet theories of reform or to support certain methods of administration as tests of Christian faith and fellowship.

There is a sense in which the Bible goes before Christ. It preserves for the world the knowledge of Him and heralds His presence; it pictures His character and life, but men thus directed to Him come to understand Him more fully and to know Him better afterwards in their own religious consciousness and personal experience. The Bible reveals Him who is the source of its own existence, or rather Christ manifests Himself in and through the word, and it must therefore itself be inter-

preted in the light of His character and life. This calls for the exercise of discrimination and judgment, as well as for true devotion, on the part of man. If Christ is the type of man, man is akin to God, and the mode of thought and reasoning are the same in both. If there are contradictions in the sacred Scriptures, as some affirm, these must be dealt with, adjusted, or resolved in such a way as to accord with the character and life of their Author. And men's hearts do generally, in spite of their theories, follow the word to its source in Christ as readily and naturally as their eyes follow the rays of light to their source in the sun; and they receive a ready and fitting answer to their desires and needs. It is only when they make some doctrine, mode of worship, form of government, or mode of administration central, instead of Christ, that they turn the Bible into a treasury of ready made theories and plans.

Knowledge is not partative. It is not a commodity, which can be in part or in whole separated from its possessor. The teacher simply reveals the thoughts, states, and intents of his mind, by which he elicits like thoughts, states, and purposes in the mind of the reader or hearer. The Bible does not teach; it is Christ that teaches, the Apostles teach, the Church teaches. But Christ is the chief Teacher, for He is the truth also, the ultimate source of all knowledge. He teaches by and through the Word and the Church. The chief point then is to keep Christ always in view, to trust Him with implicit faith, to follow whithersoever He leads in thought and life, and then we shall not fail to know and to understand His word so as to be able to apply it. Then will the Bible be a more real word of God to us than it can possibly be on the basis of a shallow bibliolatry.

Whilst the advanced thought of the day may be disposed to go to extremes in its efforts to fix the relative value and position of the Bible in the Christian system, the close observer of its trend perceives an advance towards the position which makes it, together with the consensus of the Church Catholic, the foundation upon which believers are built, Christ Jesus being the source and inspiration of both. The opposing lines along which the conflict of opinion have been moving are no longer running

parallel; they are approaching each other, and we believe the result will be a truer estimate of God's Word, and a more exalted view of Christ as the principle and source of knowledge.

But it is to be observed, in the second place, that, whilst knowledge is of great importance, an abstract word cannot save. It has been observed by one who has made the subject a profound study that, "the theory which assumes that religion consists chiefly, if not exclusively, in knowledge, and that advance in religion consists in the enlargement of our religious conceptions, has proved itself a vicious one." That knowledge is necessary and that the fact of a revelation in Christ is and always must be communicated in the form of language to arrest the mind and awaken attention and thought is true, but along with the knowledge communicated must go the power of a living person in order to make the proclamation a living word. In fact every word of communication must possess real contents, otherwise it is a mere empty sound without meaning or force. To say that Christ is made unto us "wisdom and righteousness" is to reveal a fact and to point to Him as its realization. The Apostles did not proclaim an empty word; it was a word of power to which their lives bore testimony.

But whence the power? Whence this moral force by which men change the whole current of their lives and apply all their energies to benefit the race? Whence the power that subdues wild passions, foregoes earthly pleasures and comforts to go into the wilderness and amongst heathen people, there to lay deep and broad the foundations of Christian life, of Christian learning and of Christian charity; that revolutionizes the thought and practices of ages, purifies the hearts of men, exalts woman, sanctifies the family, and in ten thousand ways, in spite of the opposition of hostile men, without violence or demonstration, subdues the human heart and makes it obedient to its will? Whence this great force whose mighty influence has, wherever it has gone, impressed itself even on the face of nature? We answer, it has its source in Christ Jesus our Lord. It is His work; His power acting upon, in and through man. This

wonderful work is not accomplished by an abstract word spoken to man, but by Christ's own peculiar and special indwelling presence with him. If, at the beginning, God created man, and if He continues to uphold him by the word of His power, so that not only his physical, but his mental forces are dependent upon Him for their being and activity, what, we may ask, is to prevent the same eternal God from renewing and re-energizing the soul powers of man by entering into special and permanent communion with him through the incarnation of His Son Jesus Christ. The conquests which the Church and men have made have not been achieved by human strength. For what purpose is it declared that Christ dwells with men, if it is not to exercise power and influence over them, to quicken their minds, to energize their wills, and thus aid them in the struggle of life? The victories which have been won over the world and the devil by individuals and the Church are due to His presence and power. He calms the raging tempest, rebukes the evil spirits; He arms His people for the conflicts of life and the building up of character; He gives peace and security.

Of course we do not mean to say that Christ, in any material or partitive sense, imparts Himself, or any portion of Himself, to His people. We may, perhaps, illustrate our meaning by calling attention to that subtle electric influence which one man exerts over another. The wise and good, for instance, by their consistent words and actions, always impart something of themselves to their fellows. The wisdom they possess and the strength of their characters are not separated from themselves and passed over or imputed to others; and yet their virtues manifesting themselves unto others quicken and strengthen them so that they arouse themselves to thought and action on similar lines. It is a mystery, but who has not become wiser and stronger and in every way better fitted for conflict and suffering by the counsel, sympathy and example of good and wise men? In like manner, but in a far deeper sense, are men quickened and strengthened by constant com-

munication with Christ. So the Apostles were lifted up. That which at first was a dawning light in their souls proved to be the power of God unto salvation, or the power of righteousness and sanctification and redemption.

But here, as in the matter of knowledge, he who does not apprehend, lay hold on Christ and imitate His example receives no moral or spiritual power. At this point the example of the smith's arm which grows and gathers strength by exercise is pertinent. Righteousness and sanctification and redemption, the results of the exercise of the moral faculties, can become the possession of those only who win them, who, so to speak, win them for themselves. To possess righteousness, the righteousness of Christ, is to be or to become righteous, and no one can be or become righteous by subtracting righteousness from Christ and adding it to himself. Such transactions are not possible in the sphere of the physical, and much less in that of the moral. As in the acquisition of knowledge, so also in the matter of bettering one's self, one must be a faithful doer of the Word. The Old and the New Testaments abundantly testify to this in the commands which they present for our guidance.

The preaching of the Apostles was not of a perfunctory character. They spoke as those who themselves believed, and by their lives they bore testimony to the truth. They were the bearers to others of the power which they themselves possessed. And the process does not stop with them. To-day men, directed to Christ by the word of God in the Scriptures and by the voice and power of God in and through the ministers and followers of Christ, draw their wisdom and strength unto salvation from Him. The Church thus is indeed the pillar and ground, the bearer of the Truth. She, in a secondary sense, produces the Bible; she decides upon the canon of Scripture; she preserves it; she expounds it; and by her history she demonstrates and testifies to the power of Christ, to whom, and to whom alone, she points as the source of light and life.

When the Apostles founded the church at Ephesus, and in fact all the congregations of their times, there was no New Tes-

tament in the form in which we now have it. It was the living preacher who was the bearer of the truth and power of God. And to-day, my friends, it is to living witnesses that we must look for the right interpretation of Christ's mission and the manifestation of His power. This again explains that progress which is manifest on every page of history since the day of Pentecost, and which will continue to the end of time. Doctrines once held have given place to those which are broader and deeper; customs once of almost universal prevalence have disappeared; love and charity, once a narrow and shallow stream, runs deeper and wider. God, in a real historical way, is revealing Himself, and we to-day are a part of the revelation; we come to be, according to the measure of our ability and faith, the bearers of His wisdom and power. Oh, Yes! In Christ we have become fellow members with the saints of the household of God. In Him we are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, and in Him, on that foundation, we are fitly framed together and grow into a holy temple in the Lord.

This knowledge and power, which issues from its source in Christ, is the means of blending Christians of all times and places into one body whose head is the Lord. In other words Christ is finally the unifying principle. As in Him men become reconciled unto God, they likewise in Him become reconciled to each other. He is the only true bond of union and fellowship. After many centuries of conflict and after much persecution the Church is gradually coming to learn and accept this important truth. At all events she is laying hold of it as never before. So long as men look away from Christ and lose sight of the fact that His chief mission and work is to better man's moral and spiritual condition, to save him from sin and cause him to work righteousness; so long as they forget, and look away from, the fact that all required of men by the Saviour Himself to constitute them fellow members with the saints is to exercise faith in Him as the source of life and salvation, and to walk in obedience to His word observing His holy ordinances,—so long, we say, as men look away from these essentials and insist on mak-

ing paramount certain doctrines, theories and opinions, whether delivered at Rome or Geneva, Dortrecht or Boston, no real approach can be made to Church union, except, perhaps, negatively, in the way of preparation. Christians may differ in opinions, and perhaps always will, on a thousand or more subordinate, non-essential matters, on the nature of the sacraments, for example, on methods of worship, forms of church government, modes of administration; but on this vital and essential point, faith in the Lord Jesus Christ and unreserved consecration to His service, they are and must be one. By this test alone the Christian and non-Christian are to be distinguished. All efforts at organic, or any other kind of Church union must be ruled by this central principle.

It used to be very popular and it sounded very plausible to say, "We make the Bible the foundation of Christian life and fellowship." But the cry in time proved itself a cheat and a fraud, for it was always the Bible as they who raised the cry understood it, and with such the test of discipleship even now narrows itself down to the observance of one or two outward forms. The only reason why the different branches of the Church are not more closely united to-day is because men have not yet learned fully and clearly to distinguish non-essentials from essentials, and to practice mutual forbearance in matters of opinion in respect to that which in no way affects or conflicts with sound, saving faith and right living. We doubt whether what is ordinarily understood by the term organic union is absolutely necessary to the realization of true Church union. But whether organic union is necessary or not, if true Church union is ever to be realized in this world, it must work itself out from Christ as the center and principle of life and co-operation, for it can never do so by starting on the periphery, where men exhibit their shallow appreciation of the great mystery of redemption in their style of dress, forms of administration and various other shibboleths.

Every honest movement looking towards organic union amongst the Christian denominations should be welcomed and

encouraged, but its advocates should, at the same time, not forget that such a movement demands, first, and above all, the spirit of toleration. Organic union, or any other form of union will not be brought about so long as men persist in forcing, or trying to force, their own peculiar views and opinions in regard to subordinate doctrines, forms and methods upon their fellow Christians. The very spirit of the Gospel is the spirit of freedom in the domain of thought. So long as men cling to Christ as the source of knowledge and strength, so long as they rest on the verities of the faith summed up in the Catholic Apostolic creed of the ages, they are entitled to be reckoned amongst the saints and as members of the household of God. They are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets. Heads may indeed go wrong, as history demonstrates, but the general trend will be towards a clearer and more correct understanding of truth; but hearts can not go wrong without faltering or stammering at the Creed. Nor can we always be too sure that this or that man, the accuser or the accused, is the one nearer the truth. Too often has the blood of martyrs proved to be the seed of the Church. When we reflect that many centuries have been required to perfect the statement of certain doctrines, as, for instance, that of the atonement, with but partial success, we must accord that measure of liberty to others which we demand for ourselves. True union, true fellowship, can exist only where men look steadfastly into the face of Christ and strive to serve Him faithfully by conforming their lives to His.

And now, brethren and friends, let us not forget that men are not to be held accountable for what they achieve in the way of spiritual knowledge and power. God does not judge men by what may be outwardly summed up, but He does judge them by the effort which they make to attain. Ah! here is where the conscience inflicts its sharpest and most potent sting. Let each one then look to Christ and be faithful to his privileges and opportunities, and each will have his highest and best reward in being permitted to join the fellowship of the redeemed in the perfected temple in the world to come. Amen.

VI.

THE CAUSES WHICH LED TO THE DISCOVERY OF AMERICA.*

BY PROF. JOHN B. KIEFFER.

"Not by eastern windows only,
When daylight comes, comes in the light;
Eastward the sun climbs slow, how slowly;
But westward, look, the land is bright."

Clough.

CHIEF among the causes which led to the discovery of America must be reckoned its paramount importance to the higher developments of human history. Those developments could not have been reached on European soil, nor could the spiritual and moral conditions achieved in Europe have been transferred to Asia and carried to their normal conclusions among the inert masses of mankind that have packed that continent for so many ages. What was absolutely necessary was an entirely new world, where human progress should not be trammelled by traditional conventions, nor impeded by having to mould to its purposes already existing but crass masses of men.

I.

As a race, no less than as an individual, man passes through a prolonged growth the end of which historically is the conscious freedom of the human spirit, and its reconciliation with its environment. To this development every age contributes in strict proportion to its ability and none can willfully increase or diminish its contribution. Far from complete though the

*The writer acknowledges his obligations to Fiske's "Discovery of America," Winsor's "Christopher Columbus," Payne's "History of the New World," Stubbs' "Lectures on Mediaeval and Modern History," and Freeman's "Chief Period of European History."

promise is, and although the Orient, with its brooding sense of oppression and its inert stability, is a present protest against rash speculation, so much at least may be affirmed: Western man—the various members of the great Aryan family—seems to be entrusted with the solemn mission of “discovering the world,” and “discovering man;” i.e., of bringing the race to its majority, of putting it in conscious possession of its inheritance, of stimulating its unprogressive members to a proper recognition of the oneness of the race in origin, power, and destiny, and so to a harmonious accord with members that are progressive that the entire race may at length be made mentally, morally, and spiritually complete.

But we shall greatly mistake the importance of the age of the great discoverers to this process if we fix our attention on its remarkable commercial activity, its tendency towards scientific thought, or its inventive spirit as shown in the mariner's compass, the printing-press, gunpowder, and the telescope, and imagine that these are the measure of its ultimate and true significance. On the contrary they are but the outer signs of a wonderful spiritual ferment agitating mankind,—only the means which the human spirit discovered whereby to penetrate the secrets of nature, win for itself, if possible, an acquaintance with first causes, and break the physical bonds by which it felt itself confined. As the history of individual man is more than the history of the tools with which he delves, or of the food on which he lives, so the history of medieval man is something more than the history of the process by which these inventions came into being. As we may say that the history of the period in which we live is the history of the conflict and growth of ideas, and that of modern times prior to the French Revolution the history of powers, forces, and dynasties, so we may say that medieval history is the history of rights and wrongs. Not that there are no rights and wrongs in the struggles that mark modern history, or no ideas working their way out in men's lives in medieval times; but in each period the fundamental principle of historical action is distinct from that of the others

in this, that one particular phase of the wants and conditions of human life forces itself into prominence, takes precedence of all others, and becomes the chief characteristic of the age.

This controlling feature of medieval history—this struggle for right, for proprietary right, for individual right—is a direct result of Roman development transferred to and carried forward by the barbarous races which Rome subdued. For, whatever were the defects in the Roman constitution, however little the idea of representation found place there, and however surely a vanquished people were disarmed, overawed by powerful legions, plundered with impunity by rapacious governors, drained of their wealth by exorbitant taxes, and of their ablest men by the solicitations of a distant capital, Rome nevertheless had established an era of law and order. Its government was severe and harsh, but it was steady and firm, and if it took the wealth of its subject provinces, it gave them the arts and sciences and manners of a civilized people, and together with these, and in one sense of far more importance than these, if not a love, at least a profound respect, for law. It was a lesson which the world of the west could have learned in the same way from no other schooling. The Teuton loved license too much to understand the value of universal right; even his religious sense had no depth, and where murder was not punished as a crime,—even if fidelity to a principle once discovered was a controlling power,—there the idea of law could scarcely be said to exist.

The general establishment of legal studies in the universities of Europe from 1000 to 1500 A.D., the measures repeatedly adopted for the suppression of the custom of private war, the proclamation at stated times of the *Peace of God*, and the multiplication of central in place of local tribunals,—all these point to a wide-spread groping after the establishment of the principle of right, and the determination of individual rights. The gradual conversion of license loving Teutons into law-abiding men, the formation of characters like that of Frederick III., the continued existence of small states by the side of larger and fiercer

states, and the respect for historical claims to the possession of territory, are so many more proofs of the same thing. And when to this we add that the wonderful persistence of that decaying and diminishing idea of the Roman Empire, as well as the no less wonderful growth of that other aggressive idea, the Papal Power, is due to this same groping after and respect for right, we can understand what is meant when it is said that the fundamental principle of the Middle Ages was that of right and wrong.

But nations harden in the process of their growth, they crystallize along the lines of their movement, and soon show an inability to carry forward the controlling and informing principle of their existence beyond a more or less well defined point of advancement. They, too, are born, live, labor, and die like individual man, and the decrepitude of age comes over them before their struggles find their fruition in the higher stages of historical progress that are to follow them. And the reason is not very hard to ascertain. It doubtless is the fact that the conservatism attaching to human life binds future efforts to past examples and so overpowers the productive and aggressive forces in human society. One of the causes contributing to this result is the influence of a people's surroundings. And although the effect produced upon its inhabitants by the physical features of a country varies with the civilization of the people, nevertheless in every instance it will be found that an extremely subtle and powerful modification of the character and action of a people is due to this one cause. A glance at the conditions imposed upon Europe in this way will show why it was that the controlling principle of medieval history could not be carried onward through the intervening stage of force and dynasty into the still higher region of idea in universal application,—why it was that new nations of vaster proportions and of wider vision, and an entirely new world, were needed for the adequate development of the human race.

A glance at the map of Europe will show that the two peninsulas which made the deepest impression on European history,

alike in ancient and in mediæval times, occupy a very singular and significant position relative to each other and to the rest of the world. Italy and Greece lie, so to speak, back to back. The eastern coast of the latter, with its numerous land-locked bays and scattered islands, seems to be reaching out invitingly to the equally numerous harbors of the opposite coasts of Asia Minor. On the west its coastline shows hardly a place where a ship can find shelter, and in every way it is inhospitable and forbidding. On the other hand, Italy is as uninviting and repelling on the east as Greece is on the west; and, offering abundance of safe harbors only on the west, seems to have left behind it that portion of the history of the world which culminated in the conquests of Alexander, and to be speculating on the mysteries and possibilities of the unknown west. But strikingly apparent as is their mutual opposition of view, they still are, each in its own way, representative portions of Europe,—Greece in particular being the most European of European lands. Being a land of multitudinous mountains and confined valleys, its very configuration lessened the danger of invasions from the interior and of wars of reprisal between separate tribes. A security to the tenure of possession elsewhere impossible was thus achieved, and that continuous development within certain narrow limits which resulted in an exhibition to the world for all time of "what man can be in a narrow space, and in a short space of time."

But (and it is here that Greece serves as an illustration of the limitations of Greater Greece,—which is Europe) while the configuration of its territory tended to protect every portion of the Greek people from being conquered, "it also kept them politically disunited," and "fostered that powerful principle of repulsion which disposed even the smallest township to constitute itself a political unit apart from the rest, and to resist all idea of coalescence either amicable or compulsory,"—so that to a Greek his individual city was all in all, and to lose it was to lose all that made life worth living. And although this negative effect was largely modified by the constant influence of the sea,

which drew men into an intercourse as much more varied and stimulating than that of the Phenicians, as the commerce of the latter was more extensive, but also more purely material, than that of the Greeks, it nevertheless was the final cause of the humiliation and ruin of the Hellenic people. And this tendency of the physical features of a country to accentuate the individuality of its inhabitants is so fixed and persistent that to this day traces of the rivalries and local jealousies which wrought this ruin may be found in Bœotia, in Sparta, in the islands of the Ægean, and in every corner of what once was Hellas.

Now what is true of Greece is true of the whole of Europe. For, unlike the extensive plains and table lands of Asia, Europe is not the home of vast aggregations of homogeneous human beings, socially and spiritually stationary and self-centered, but the home of peoples the ruling principle of whose social compact tends naturally and inevitably to separation, particularity and antagonism. And although the separation and antagonism begets variety as the foundation of many-sided activity and essential to the very inception of progress, the physical conditions that render it inevitable at the same time also prevent it from reaching the highest type and most perfect state of human development. Western Europe is far in advance, however, of the position occupied by Greece in this, that with the very commencement of its independent growth a larger conception of human destiny, a broader generalization of human conditions and relations, begins to develop and force itself into view. In this process, which has been called "the physical growth of the world," the substitution of the nation for the city becomes an all important feature. As long as any shadow of Roman power lasted, and wherever that power had made itself felt, the city, even as it had been in Greece, was the natural centre of social political life. But with the dissolution of the Roman Empire the Teuton and the Slave came upon the scene and ever since have held the most important position in all social and political movements. The advance which this change marks lies in the fact that Teutonic political society starts from the tribe, and

not from the city. The city of southern Europe resisted all intimations of coalescence, and agreed to federation only when forced to do so by external compulsion. Whatever union might be effected in this way not only involved in some degree a mutual concession of superiority and inferiority, but was also only a temporary grouping and sure to fall in pieces so soon as the outward compelling necessity was withdrawn. On the other hand, two tribes may be physically rolled into one and the resulting union will involve no subjection or admission of inferiority, and so will be natural and abiding. It was by such fusions that the great nations of Europe, Italy, France, Spain, England and Germany took shape. To such an extent was the principle operative, indeed, that it eventually led to the consolidation of political powers, until a king could say *L'Etat c'est moi*, and of spiritual functions until an ecclesiastical autocrat likewise could declare *L'Eglise c'est moi*.

But all this was done slowly and obscurely, amid stupidity and ignorance, and with the utmost travail of the human soul. Nothing came suddenly and human life moved on in its accustomed grooves as if no change, no development, no enlargement, no liberation was possible, or in course of growth. And yet the truth was not without its witnesses. There were prophecies upon prophecies of the coming birth of liberty and of the spirit of tolerance, but they fell upon dull ears, and when the birth came it was through a baptism of blood and death. The empire of Charlemagne in the second generation already fell to pieces, not only because of the will of Louis the Pious, but also because the Franks of Gaul were separating from the Franks of Germany, and those of Germany from the people of Italy. The destructive tendency of Europe to the individual and particular was asserting itself. And it did not cease until it had produced a condition of utter isolation where only might was right, where no validity was given to the claims of virtue and of law, but brutal lust, a most barbarous caprice, deceit and cunning were the moral features of the age. Vice, we are told, was enthroned, and its reign was an era of riotous debauchery. No

wonder that men could find no repose and Christendom was, so to speak, "agitated with the tremors of an evil conscience." No wonder that "the fear of the approaching final judgment and the speedy dissolution of the world spread throughout Europe," and filled pious men's souls with dismay so that they passed their lives amid the gloom and rigors of unending penance. In the words of Mr. Symonds: "During the middle ages man lived enveloped in a cowl. He had not seen the beauty of the world, or had seen it only to cross himself and turn aside and tell his beads. Like St. Bernard traveling along the shores of lake Lemman, and noticing neither the azure of the waters nor the radiance of the mountains with their robe of sun and snow, but bending a thought-burdened forehead over the neck of his mule; even like this monk humanity had passed a careful pilgrim intent on the terrors of sin, death and judgment, along the highways of the world, and had scarcely known that they were sight-worthy, or that life is a blessing. Beauty is a snare, pleasure a sin, the world a fleeting show, man fallen and lost, death the only certainty, judgment inevitable, hell everlasting, heaven hard to win; ignorance is acceptable to God, abstinence and mortification the only safe rules of life; these were the ideas of the Ascetic Medieval Church." But amid this desolation and the ruin wrought by this abeyance of the human understanding there were not wanting efforts to break the enveloping gloom. Pitiful as is the thought of medieval students "poring over a single sentence of Porphyry, endeavoring to extract from its clauses whole systems of logical science," or of "tide after tide of the ocean of humanity sweeping from all parts of Europe to break in passionate but unavailing foam upon the shores of Palestine," it was by precisely such struggles that the way was being prepared for the coming change. In their very midst Abelard was trying to prove that the endless dispute about things and names rested on a misapprehension; Joachim of Flora was crying: "The Gospel of the Father is passed, the Gospel of the Son is passing, the Gospel of the Spirit is to be," and Roger Bacon was anticipating the

reign of modern science. But neither the Church nor the State, the mystic nor the scholar, could bridge over the chasm between what Europe was doing and what humanity needed to do before the last age could be ushered in. That particularity which was the inherent weakness of European history, bred of selfishness and fostered by social and political, as well as physical, conditions, was too strong a solvent to permit anything but temporary and partial unions.

And what was true of Europe during the Middle Ages is true of Europe to-day. No unions but such as are forced from without by considerations of expediency find place there. Each nation does what is right in its own eyes, and nothing but an inherent respect for traditional legality, and a dread of the superior force of a covetous neighbor prevents the destructive exercise of power for selfish ends. The underlying principle of European history during the modern period has been that of the *Balance of Power*,—a principle which may be said to differ from the destructive selfishness of the Feudal period only in this that it is a recognized convention forced by general expediency and sustained by common consent,—a principle whose importance is equalled only by its difficulty and the unevenness of its application. For according to it the weak state is bound to the strictest fulfillment of every international stipulation, but the strong is absolved by the mere possession of strength from any vexatious and involuntary observance of its requirements. And this inequitable application of the principle is not rectified by the institution or recognition of arbitration. The strong puts its own construction on the law, and the weak has no redress.

A little reflection will show the truth of this. Beginning with the Reformation,—which was as much a struggle of force as it was a struggle of idea,—here force prevailing and there idea, the purer form proving ultimately to be the weaker,—whatever union had already been secured begins to break up, and the disruption recognizes no principle, following in one case territorial lines and in another the caprice of a monarch

or the cunning of a diplomatist. Spain at first is the all-threatening force, and intrigues for the dismemberment of France while France is intriguing for the dismemberment of the Netherlands. Soon the United Provinces gain recognition, and the action of Spain begins to grow languid. Then comes the *Thirty Years' War*,—"Austria against the princes, Catholic against Protestant, ancient territorial right as against new territorial force." Then follow the glories of Louis XIV. against alliances not of principle but of expediency, the struggles of the Spanish and Imperial successions, and the triumphant career of Frederick II. What page of European history does not furnish instances of this turmoil? Indulgence agitations in Germany, divorce agitations in England, growth of Huguenotism in France, the rise of men like Luther, Melancthon, Zwingli, Calvin and Knox,—all were intimations that western society was, as it always had been, a seething mass of conflicting individual interests, and that it was struggling to break away from the past, from the repression and deadening effect of national traditions, and from the palsy influence of religious traditions, into a world of broader scope and truer freedom, where human action might run in channels not blocked by the formalities of *ex post facto* law, but reach out towards speedier realizations of its inherent hopes. But in all this change and strife the law of self-protection amongst the powers imposed the necessity of combinations—combinations against the propaganda of liberty during the French Revolution, and combinations against the propaganda of imperial consolidation under Napoleon. Even since 1848 Europe has been the scene of constant excitement, uneasiness, and mistrust. Again the cry of Fraternity, Liberty, Equality from France threw the political world into turmoil, and again an appeal to force and the old views of legality seemed to prevail and save society. And when, beginning with the Crimean War, the doctrine of the Balance of Power lost much of its authority and made way for another, that other was found to be not only not more unselfish but also no better calculated to advance the interests of

absolute right,—the doctrine, namely, of *non-intervention*. To assert that these two political canons were only names to cover up the duplicity and corrupt practices of crafty diplomatists and nothing more would, indeed, be too sweeping a denunciation of what was really the best that men of deservedly high reputation in point of character and political wisdom could do under the circumstances. But the partition and suppression of Poland showed how easily fraud and force could remove territorial landmarks; and the mistake of the Crimean war, if mistake it was, proved how ready a mercenary and unprincipled diplomacy was to embroil the nations, if thereby one might gain even a temporary advantage.

Any examination of European history such as here indicated, whether ecclesiastical, political, or social, will show the same feature of inability to compass such a general principle of action as shall include all men and all times. Blind adhesion to theological dogma, an unwavering insistency on the power of what so often proves a laggard in human life, to wit, the law, child-like admiration of the past that cleaves to all men and blocks the way of change and reform, the careful maintenance of sharply defined class-distinctions, isolation, particularity, and want of balance alike in individual character and in state action, and the unsatisfying struggle for more perfect organizations always falling back into old forms—all go to sustain the view that the mission in human history which Europe was appointed to fill was a partial and limited mission,—a highly important step in the progress of the race, indeed, but only a step, and one that brought the race to the threshold of a new world and to a glorious revelation of new and astounding possibilities.

And the completion of four centuries of new world history finds the view sustained that the discovery of America has provided for the exigencies of Europe precisely what was needed. For alike in their physical features and in their contributions to the food supplies of the earth the continents of the western hemisphere are specially fitted to be the homes of vast aggregations of men. They are not continents of manifold divisions

and subdivisions where all possible growth is limited by mountain barriers and all historical action is doomed to expend itself in the construction of isolated and detached political organizations, or to follow up only individual lines of development with little or no power to group, fuse, and correlate them all in a large and more comprehensive whole. The discovery of America was the introduction, not to a continent, or an ocean, but, as Mr. Freeman pointed out, to "a world of continents and oceans,"—a world whose vastness "nothing better shows than the fact that we are driven to form a plural for this last primeval name,"—a world to which "the ocean and his borderlands are what the *Ægean* and its borderlands, the *Mediterranean* and its borderlands" were to the world we have outgrown. Here everything is on a scale to which nothing in Europe corresponds. Our mountains can hardly be called barriers, and our lakes and our rivers are the natural highways of intercourse and trade on a scale which elsewhere would be sought in vain. Nature seems to have consumed the ages during which what may be the last home of the race was enveloped in impenetrable gloom in studying the wants of the race and fashioning this wonderful land in every particular to meet them as they should be revealed. And the struggle which marked the social and political coming of age of this new world was a struggle against particularity and separation, and the assertion of a principle of union which rested on the recognition of the essential freedom and equality of men, and on the confident belief that the people are as true and reliable an exponent and protector of justice as enthroned senility, or diplomatic conceit. Nowhere in all history did international politics reach so high a point of ethical elevation as in the Geneva arbitration between the United States and Great Britain; and nowhere did it happen that such questions as are involved in the lockout at Homestead, or the strike at Buffalo, were made the basis of a general demand for arbitration, or for the suggestion that the revision of laws determining the rights and the relations of property was the crying need of the

hour, in the way that suggestion has recently been put forth. Nor has the principle of universality which seems already to be distinguishing the New World from the Old failed to find in America sufficient scope for its action. The discoveries which go so far towards annihilating separation in space and separation in time nowhere are more significant, and nowhere have a more fruitful and forcible application. The steamer, the railway, the telegraph, the telephone, are wholesome and necessary institutions considered only in their bearing upon the material, or physical conditions of a people; but they are potencies of prime importance in a proper estimate of the spiritual destiny of the race. Because they "hinder man's political and intellectual life from being crushed by mere physical extension," because they enable large states and nations to rise to the political level of small ones, and make it possible for the United States, spread over a world far wider than any age of Roman Empire, to abide as a representative composite nation, free and freely united, they are blessings whose magnitude can be measured only by their necessity.

And if we turn from political considerations we shall find in the church and in society the same struggle for ideas and universal conceptions. Revision of creeds, assertions of new principles of interpretation and new constructions of dogmas, the deeply felt need of the removal of old time walls of separation and of closer union, and the disposition to concede the claim for help to rise to the level of their rights and their powers on the part of the lower classes, all are intimations that the old-time conventions are losing power and that the day of larger and nobler things is at hand.

The *New World* stands,—not for the wealth that Columbus sought, not for freedom from restraint only in the sense of license, not even for the conversion of the heathen to a form of religion which permitted the destruction of the heathen by means of slavery and all that slavery involves,—but it stands for the adequate realization and the universal application of the idea of right, of liberty, which the old world felt after long-

ingly, and realized in so many imperfect foreshadowings only, but could not perfectly achieve. It stands for the confirmation by the Spirit of that universal brotherhood of man which the Son made the second great commandment. Joachim of Flora might now well say: "The Gospel of the Father is passed, the Gospel of the Son is passed, the Gospel of the Spirit is here." Without the discovery of America this could not have been—that it might be was the chief cause of that great event.

II.

Even as is the coming of the light when the day is breaking, so is the coming of the truth in any of its forms. The first faint almost imperceptible glimmer which hovers above the distant hills gradually expands into a steady effulgence and fills the upper air; anon long streams of ruddy light shoot towards the far zenith, and last of all the full orb of the glad sun rolls aloft and scatters the gloom that still lingers in the lowlands. And such was the Discovery of America,—not an act the full credit and glory of which one man might claim and appropriate,—not an occurrence befalling human history with no antecedent connection or relation thereto,—not an incident having no effect upon the ultimate issues of human progress,—but a long and steady process. Of this process the second principal cause, subordinate to the one that has been discussed, as a temporal realization is subordinate to a divine purpose, but supreme above others and comprehending them all, is man's ceaseless striving for the betterment of his condition,—and that, not in material comfort only, but in all that is involved in the full exercise of the highest functions of which he finds himself the centre. So far as we can trace it, it appears first in the eastern Mediterranean along with the dawn of European civilization.

And, as in all things terrestrial every movement follows the line of the least resistance and every historical process rests on an economical basis, so the very first indications of a steady growth, whether of the Phenician or the Greek, manifests a

constant tendency on the part of those early races to find relief and expansion, as well as easier sustenance, in the yet unexplored and virgin west. For it was not the case that speculative and adventurous spirits who were dissatisfied and restless at home were the only authors of such movements, or that dispossessed peoples alone sought new homes and founded colonies in unknown lands, and so discovered the store of wealth that had long been hidden from the greed and use of men. Before the Phenicians settled Cadiz or the Phocæans Marseilles the ships of kings had scoured the seas for conquest and for pillage; and the tales we are told of the gold that Jason brought from Colchis, or of that which the Griffins guarded against the one-eyed Arimaspeans, show that the desire for riches and the power that riches bestow was an original source of the tendency, and did not first attach to it when Ferdinand and Isabella granted the long-delayed wish of the great discoverer. And it was not only Minos ridding the sea of pirates that the king of Egypt might fill his coffers with tribute, or Dido fleeing Pygmalion's wrath and laying the foundations of the power which was to contend with Rome for the dominion of the world, that exhibited the constant westward tendency of historical growth. Even that Hebrew prophet who fled from the face of the Lord in a ship of Tarshish, and that other Hebrew prophet, who, foreshadowing the golden age of the chosen people, saw in vision the pouring towards Zion of all the abundance of the sea, "the ships of Tarshish flying from far 'as a cloud and as doves to their windows,' and bringing with them 'their silver and their gold,'—even these are witnesses to the wide extension the tendency had already reached. For this Tarshish of Ezekiel's vision and of Jonah's desire was the Tartessus of Spain,—as true an *El Dorado* to the Phœnician mariners of, it may be, fifteen hundred years before Christ as Mexico and Peru were to Cortez and Pizarro fifteen hundred years after Christ. For it was a land of most fabulous resources, where the Tagus rolled down its gold, and the Guadiana its silver, where the sailors used chunks

of the precious metals as anchors for their boats, and the Iberians fed their horses in mangers of gold, and seethed their beer in vats of silver. And we may be sure that the crafty people who had control of the sea, and in whose hands for centuries had been the commerce of the western world, flocked to the mines that "stuffed the coast of Spain from the Tagus to the Pyrenees," and with jealous care guarded the secret of their rapidly growing wealth from all possible competitors.

It cannot be considered a wild conjecture to say that, when all this was doing, and venturesome mariners were even daring the billows of the ocean, the Carthaginian Himilco and his fleet, drifting on the Sea of Darkness, might have discovered America more than two thousand years before the great Genoese was born. But such an accident—for accident it certainly had been—would have been productive of no results, as even the much later discoveries of the Canaries and the Azores, or even of Vinland the Good, proved to be. The fullness of the time was not yet come, and Rome, not Carthage, was to be heir to the ripe intelligence of the world, and a Teutonic Aryan, not a Phœnician Semite, the bearer of its best fruits to the lands beyond the western flood. Carthage had no ideals; and so Carthage perished, and left scarce a trace of its being, save where her trading instincts had founded towns which lived and prospered when she was gone. And the ideals even of Rome needed to be purged and uplifted by the clearer intellect of Greece, and transferred to the more intense and purer devotion of a new people and a new faith, before they could be made fruitful of true life to men. It was accordingly in Greece and by Greeks that the first conscious effort which eventually issued in the discovery of America was made,—if we may call that a conscious effort which was but the speculative deduction from more or less careful observation. For the conquests of Alexander, with such a master of scientific thought as Aristotle to study and weigh them, could not but have added a wonderful zest to all inquiries into natural phenomena, but especially into the fundamental idea of all geography, namely,

the position and shape of the earth. That the earth was a sphere, and that it was situated at the centre of the universe and there remained at rest, was the accepted belief of philosophers in the time of Aristotle. What the latter contributed to this view was,—first, the proofs, from the natural tendency of matter to gravitate to a common centre, and from the circular appearance of the shadow of the earth during an eclipse of the moon, that the earth was round; secondly, the proof that the earth is of comparatively small dimensions, as derived from the notable change in the aspect of the heavens by a journey only as far as from Greece to Egypt; and, thirdly, his inference that in the southern hemisphere there was a temperate zone corresponding to that of the northern hemisphere; but, above all, his declaration that the tract between the columns of Hercules and India might be inhabited, and could be visited if it were not for the great extent of the sea. A crude surmise, and nothing more, this latter doubtless was, but still it showed that thoughtful men were speculating on the possibilities of the unknown tracts of the terrestrial sphere. And the surmise of Aristotle waited hardly more than a half century for the father of systematic geography to give it further corroboration, to fix on a scientific basis much that with him had been conjecture, and to affirm that it was wholly possible to reach the remote east by sailing to the remote west. For, although Pythias of Marseilles had calculated the latitude of his native town to within a minute of the truth years before Eratosthenes was born, it was Eratosthenes who first measured a degree on the meridian and so determined the size of the earth. And the determination of the size of the earth was a long step forwards in the matter of western adventure. It led to an approximate estimate of the extent of the Atlantic, and tempted men repeatedly to think its passage possible. For we are mistaken if we imagine that such dreams were not entertained. Men of extensive acquirements and keen intellects, the scholars of Alexandria, who, to assist their studies, constructed globes and laid out upon them the portions of the earth which then

were known, surely could not avoid the thought that in the expanse west of Europe might be other lands habitable, if not already inhabited. And had not the Roman Marcellus, into whose hands the magnificent globes of Archimedes fell along with other Syracusan spoil, been a land staying mortal the suggestions of his plunder might have awakened in him, or in his people, some immediately responsive speculation on this fruitful theme. But though Greek surmises were permitted to sleep at Rome, they slept but for a season. Posidonius, Cicero, Lucan, and how many more, inspired by their example and instruction, took up and treasured the tempting thought. And Seneca, repeating Posidonius' phrase, exclaimed: "Pray, how far is it from the farthest shores of Spain westward to those of India? A very few days' sail, with a fair wind at your back," and then wrote that passage over which Columbus is said to have pondered with so much patient and hopeful longing: "The Indian now quaffs the Araxes; the Persian drinks of the Elbe and the Rhine. And the time shall even come when the raging ocean itself, instead of being a limit and an obstacle, shall become a means of communication. The *οἰκουμένη* will thus be thrown open, the pilots of the ocean will discover new *οἰκοῦμεναι* and there shall no longer be a remotest Thule on the map." A century later, as if with the deliberate intention of inducing men to attempt the passage of the Atlantic, Marinus Tyrius, the father of mathematical geography, declared that the land surface of the globe occupied fifteen hours of the sun's course, so that but nine hours were left for the western voyager to traverse. And although his great successor Ptolemy made the width of the ocean equal to the extent of the land surface, the fact that all these ancient geographers attached so much importance to determining the true extent of the ocean shows that they were consciously speculating on the possibility of crossing it, and of realizing even in Ptolemy's time what Eratosthenes had said four centuries before, that, namely, were it not for the extent of the Atlantic we should be able to sail from Spain to India.

Moreover the discovery that Cicero was wrong in imagining

that there was a broad girdle of ocean in the region of the equator, and that instead the western coast of Africa extended in an unbroken line towards the south, or as Ptolemy believed even to the south pole, brought with it the conviction that if ever India was to be reached from Europe by sea it must be by the western route across the Atlantic.

This result of the speculations of the ancient geographers met with but indifferent treatment, and even with opposition, during the middle ages. Men had other things to think of. Their souls were brooding over their sins and the mysteries of their transcendent faith. Their belief that Christ died to save all men that dwell upon the earth could not admit the speculative conception of other continents than that on which Christ lived and died, or of another race who were not of the seed of Adam. "What fool," cries Lactantius, "believes that there are men walking with their feet higher than their heads? That objects which with us lie upon the ground, are there suspended from it? That plants and trees spring downward, while snow, rain and hail fall upward?" And even the great Augustine, with all his large experience of life, declared: "The fable of the Antipodes, that is, of men whose feet are opposite to ours, is on no account to be believed." But yet this was not so much a blind contention against scientific truth, as it was a bold declaration of the certainty of the faith which they professed. Not the sphericity of the earth, but the existence of beings outside the reach of divine grace, was the object of their denial and contempt. And so the truth maintained its ground in the face of their opposition and from time to time found more or less adequate utterance. The English Alcuin, the German Rabanus Maurus, the Arabian geographers, the prophetic soul of Dante, Albertus Magnus and Roger Bacon, were the successive heralds who handed it on until Aliacus embodied the cosmographical views of the ancients in his work called *Imago Mundi*, and so transmitted them to Columbus. For this was the book which the great Genoese most pondered, and from which he received most encouragement for his undertaking.

For the eminent author had improved upon this conjecture of Seneca, and resolutely affirmed that "the Atlantic ocean could be sailed over in a few days, if the wind were favorable, and was in fact but a comparatively narrow strip of sea running north and south between India and Spain."

But the genius of Columbus, eminently speculative though it was, could not ignore the characteristics of his age and country. It was gold and precious stones, drugs and spices, that the age demanded. A proposition to cross the ocean merely for the sake of discovery would never have won the attention either of church or state, monarch or people. And undoubtedly, if Columbus had been told that eastern Asia was three-fourths of the earth's circumference from western Europe, and that the way thither was barred by a continent extending from the extreme north to the extreme south, he would have abandoned all thought of the attempt. Another set of circumstances, which may be called a subsidiary cause, was needed in order to precipitate the attention of Europe in the direction of western adventure. When the west of Europe came to be densely populated, and its resources fully developed, even to the shore of the ocean, there was no farther-west towards which to look for easy conquests and for rapid growth in wealth. The barren waste of the Sea of Darkness was as a wall of enclosure shutting in its people, and they could not, or at least did not, concern themselves with the problem of what might lie out beyond it. Eastward their attention was irresistibly drawn, not only because from immemorial times the east was the abode of tribes and nations which Europe had reason to fear, but also because there was much there which Europe had reason to love and long to obtain. How full it was of all that man's heart could desire; what a home of wealth, and luxury, and splendor; how rich a market for the iron and copper, the quicksilver and timber, the slaves and corn of Europe could there be found; how soon the results of Alexander's expedition to this land so richly gifted by nature and so full of the treasures accumulated by the toil of man were forgotten; how the Tartar invasion of

Europe and the effort to convert those hordes of the steppe to Christ, the travels of Marco Polo, and the marvellous tales of Sir John Mandeville, reopened and stimulated the trade of Europe with the far East, it would detain us much too long to tell.

But rich as was the ensuing commerce, its balances always were in favor of the East. The three hundred thousand ducats in coin which the ships of Venice yearly carried to Alexandria to meet the demands of this trade was a drain which Europe was wholly unable to bear. And the resulting increase in values, so that in one century "the purchasing power of gold and silver was double the same power in the century preceding," began to imperil the prosperity of the Mediterranean commercial centres. A more economical route to the east was an absolute necessity to the longer continuance of successful traffic. And so in the thirteenth century already the Genoese began to extend their explorations beyond the Straits of Gibraltar in the hope that the discovery of such a route might avert the threatening disaster. Their failure to find what they sought, and the gradual strangling of their Oriental trade by the growing power of the Turk, followed by its complete extinction in the fall of Constantinople in 1453, raised the question: "Can there be an outside route?" as it never had been raised before. It was a startling question, but back of it lay the thoughts and speculations and dreams of centuries, and many an abortive effort to cross the expanse, and also many an unmistakable evidence that lands and peoples lay beyond the flood. To meet the terrors of an ocean voyage when so much was at stake, how could that be impossible to men who already had sailed to the Canaries and the Azores, and who knew of others who had sailed from the Red Sea to India? The impelling necessity of such a route found the men of the age prepared to meet and to treat it with consummate boldness, for they had been trained as, perhaps, the men of no other age were trained to the perils of the sea.

And it is very significant that when at last the age of ex-

ploration was practically begun it was to Genoa, the last great centre of the trade with the far east, that the princes of the west looked for captains to conduct their ventures. Italian ship-builders built and launched their ships and Italian sailors manned them; Italian mathematicians instructed their captains and Italian bankers supplied the venturesome undertakers with the necessary means. The trade which so suddenly had been cut off, when Constantinople was taken, as with the shears of Atropos, was seeking to renew and prolong its life. But it was no less significant that a prince of the remotest west of Europe, who united in himself the chief characteristics of the age,—a religious enthusiast, a military hero, a speculative philosopher, and a venturesome trader,—took in hand and systematically organized the efforts to find a release for the pent up traffic of the Mediterranean. That on the sacred promontory which men deemed the westernmost limit of the habitable earth Prince Henry of Portugal should erect an astronomical observatory, should “gather about him a school of men competent to teach and eager to learn the mysteries of map-making and of the art of navigation,” and thence year after year should send forth his captains and his fleets in quest of such a route to wealth and empire for Portugal, shows how consciously, deliberately, fearlessly men were resolving that the secret should at last be wrested from the grasp of the ocean, and that civilized humanity should enter upon its inheritance and appropriate to its uses every corner of the habitable globe, as well as every instrumentality which Nature had treasured up against the time of man's need.

But not by a single effort was the secret to be won

“From its eternity of sleep
Within unfathomable gulfs of time.”

It is in the very nature of man's relation to the world that he must appropriate and work into the fibre of his being by slow and steady assimilation every phase of the physical universe as it is slowly revealed to his intelligence. From the

time when Prince Henry, the navigator, erected his observatory and entered upon the work of his life (1418) to the time when Bartholomew Diaz brought the news to Lisbon that he had circumnavigated Africa and discovered the route to the east (1487) more than two generations of men had passed away, and many a voyage begun with the stoutest hopes had ended in failure and defeat. And when, in the midst of these repeated efforts the disappointing voyage of Santarem and Escobar (1471) seemed to prove that the coast of Africa was continuous toward the south and cut off all hope of reaching India and Cathay in that direction, but one thought was left to the expectant mariners to whom these voyages promised so much,—and that the startling thought that the voyage across the Atlantic might after all alone be practicable.

Among the men who were wrestling with this problem with so much courage and patient resolution, there was one who outranked all others in originality and the power and sweep of his imagination,—the only one who could seize upon that startling thought and live it into action. For it was at precisely this darkest juncture in Portuguese exploration in 1471 that Christopher Columbus dared to make his own and work for what through so many ages had been conceivable, but still was so alarming in its dreadful suggestiveness. And in him and his work the second chief cause of the discovery of America found its final result. Men may put upon his life and character what estimate they think reasonable and right, this much we must hold to be true: He did not stand alone, and his character and his acts were the offspring of the ages which produced him. If he proved "the despoiler of the new world," if he left it a "legacy of devastation and crime," if he showed himself to be a "rabid seeker for gold and a viceroyalty," if "he gained the execrations of good angels," and "gave his contemporaries an example of perverted belief," it was in the very nature of things that all this should be so. The earthly cause which led to the discovery of America involved precisely such negations and inconsist-

encies as these. It involved the upheaval of European society and the shifting of its centre of action; it involved the bringing into play at one and the same time of gigantic characters in themselves of most uneven development, and of the most divergent and contrary tendencies in their mutual relations; and it involved the bringing up for readjustment all the accepted conventions of European political and religious life. From the time of the first faint trace of western adventure as we find it in the Mediterranean, and the hesitating conjectures and surmises of Aristotle and others, the philosophers and mathematicians of Europe, down to Columbus and his work, it was not only religious enthusiasm, nor only political sagacity, nor only commercial enterprise, nor only individual force and greed, which created the desire and conducted the quest for new lands and new sources of revenue in the West. Not one but all of these forces united and continuously modifying each other served to produce the variegated and contradictory personality and career of the illustrious Genoese. The age which grew such men as Dante, Savanorola, Luther, Melancthon, Calvin and Zwingli, and such monsters as Ezzelino, the Borgias, and the Farnesi, was, indeed, an age from which to expect the most heroic and the most atrocious deeds, the most ennobling and the most debasing lives,—an age in which to find diabolical craft and heavenly devotion united in the same character—almost in the same act. Our poor human nature, with all its deficiencies, its aspiring hopes, and its noble powers, was struggling towards its more perfect state, and, in the midst of its relapses and moral perversions, was more and more fully realizing its own essential grandeur in the abiding belief that “there is a spirit in man, and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth him understanding.”

For this is the sum of the matter: If man were not relative and imperfect, indefinite growth and progress in this life were impossible. Only because he is too great for the world in which he lives, but yet shut up within its limitations and subject to its conditions, his life is a life of repeated failures,—but

failures which grow by divine guidance of all that in him is
divine into repeated successes. For only thus can he hope to
rench

“ the ultimate angels’ law,
Indulging every instinct of the soul
There where law, life, joy, impulse are one thing.”

VII.

SIMON BAR-JONA: THE STONE AND THE ROCK.

BY MRS. T. C. PORTER.

CHAPTER SIXTH.

A FOUNDATION STONE.

"And I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock * I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."—St. Matt. xvi. 18.

SECTION I.

"Who shall declare His Generation?" †

"When Jesus came into the coasts of Cæsarea Philippi, he asked his disciples, saying, Whom do men say that I the Son of man am? And they said, Some say that thou art John the Baptist: some, Elias; and others, Jeremias, or one of the prophets. He saith unto them, But whom say ye that I am? And Simon Peter answered and said, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God. And Jesus answered and said unto him, Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jona: for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven. And I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."

Considering the time and circumstances, it is easy to im-

* This sentence—"Thou art Peter, and upon this rock"—is "one of the profoundest and most far-reaching prophetic, but, at the same time, one of the most controverted sayings of the Saviour.—*P. S. Lange's Com. p. 293.*

† "And who shall declare his generation?" "The words are difficult, but as rendered in the A. V. give a good sense; Who will enumerate Christ's posterity? *i. e.*, no one will; for His career was short and transient. He founded no high family on earth, no noble lineage like that of David. He bore the cross, and despised the shame, and then went back thither whence He came, to sit at God's right hand."—*Com. on O. T. Isaiah, liii. 8.*

agine with what anxiety the Master asked His disciples this most vital question—"Whom do men say that I the Son of Man am?" It was not long ("about a year") before His death. The feeling had spread widely among the Jews that their Messiah was at hand, and their chief priests and rulers were becoming more and more impressed by, and angered at, His monstrous, though as yet inferential, claim to be the Son of God, of one life, or substance, and eternal, with Jehovah.

All things were tending to the grand event of the great day of atonement—the slaying of the prophet Jesus, who, by many, was called "the Christ." What impression, He now asked the twelve, preparatory to a still greater question, had His teachings and works made upon the people at large. "Whom do men say that I the Son of man am?"

"Some say that thou art John the Baptist: some, Elias; and others, Jeremias, or one of the prophets," answered the disciples. That was all. His miracles of teaching, of healing, even of raising the dead in His own name, had produced no greater effect on His countrymen than the far lesser miracles of the ancient prophets. They were hardened. Lifted above all other nations in having received the law "by the disposition of angels," they had not kept it, and now, raised again above the world in the gift and presence of the Messiah, they received not Him. To them, He was no more than Elias, or Jeremias, or one of the prophets! Being then no more, they could and would be influenced to put Him to death, as their fathers had killed those, for they were to fill up the measure of their iniquity in slaying Him. Such was the opinion of the populace. But the language of the disciples would have been very different, could they have reported the estimate of those in authority. These, in their private councils, had decided that a prophet, no matter how great his works might be, who could deviate from their watchword of "but one God," as they held it, and all which followed, was worthy of nothing short of death by crucifixion.

SECTION II.

"But whom say Ye that I Am?"

After meeting the repulse of the nation, generally, it can be readily understood with what far greater anxiety Jesus asked His disciples, "But whom say ye that I am?" "*Who*," or "*Whom*," He asked—not, *what* do ye say that I am. To ask them, at that time, *what* He was, would have been premature, for His work was not yet done. "*Who*," or rather (since "*who*" refers more to the individual, and what he has made of himself), "*Whom*," in the sense,—Of whose life or substance do I partake, He inquired. It is the *person* that gives character to the work, especially when that work—the redemption of many—is based on his life, and its derivation. And as Christ's disciples were soon to preach, equally, Him and His work, the two great questions for them to answer now, and first of all, were, "*Who* do ye say that I am," and *of* or *from* "*Whom* say ye that I am?"

Time was passing. He had many things to tell them which could not be imparted till formally assured of the light in which they regarded Him. His death so near, and by crucifixion; His resurrection, ascension, and the advent of the Spirit, all, were yet to be made known to them; and He waited but the words which should open His mouth. Would they speak? And, speaking, what would they say? Who should declare His generation?

Vain are the hopes set on men, even on those who love Him. They move not their lips; and the Son of Man silently appeals to His Father, by whom the revelation was to be made to Simon. Then looking steadfastly at this disciple, Simon meets the searching gaze, and quickly and boldly answers to the first question—"Who"—"Thou art the Christ," and to the second question—"Whom"—"the Son of the living God."

Faultless, and sparkling with heaven's own light, the pre-

cious truth rolled from his lips, but only to be quickly caught and set by the Master as the brightest jewel in His servant's martyr-crown. The rapture with which He received it, thrills in the eloquence and fervor of the benediction—"Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jona: for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven." And then he adds thereto His own personal assurance: "And I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." Moreover, He is not content with this, but in exceeding joy lifts him above his fellows by a third and special blessing and reward: "And I will give unto *thee* the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." "*Whatsoever*," He said, even though it should reach, as the result showed, to that great, and then incredible work of closing the Jewish church and opening the Christian!

In that confession of Simon's there was far more than appears on its surface. Jesus always, and even at the judgment seat, called Himself "the Son of Man;" and this ground—His humanity—He never leaves, but standing immovably on it asks all believers to the end of time the same that He asked the apostles—"But whom say ye that I, *the Son of Man*, am?"

SECTION III.

"Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God."

"Thou art the Christ, the Son of God," (or promised Messiah) "which should come into the world," said Martha to Jesus. And, "Lord (Christ or Messiah), "if thou hadst been here my brother had not died," said both Mary and Martha, the sisters of Lazarus. Such was their conception, then, of Christ's personality, even though Mary had chosen that "good part"—to sit as a learner at His feet. The woman of Samaria also had exalted views of the Jewish Messiah, for she

said to Jesus, "I know that Messias cometh, which is called Christ: when he is come he will tell us all things." And afterwards she went into the city, "and saith unto the men, Come, see a man which told me all things that ever I did: is not this the Christ?"

It was not possible for those women-disciples to know more at that time. The knowledge of Christ's eternal divinity was reserved for Simon Bar-Jona; and the revelation was to be made to him through the agency of that Spirit, or Breath, which blows when and where it lists, and can not be seen, nor heard, nor felt, but whose presence is made known by its heavenly fruits. And the abundant proof of this Spirit's presence in Simon's heart was his open acknowledgment (when the moment came for it) of Jesus as "the Son of the living" (and life-giving) "God." This confession rose as high above that of the women, and the opinion, perhaps, of most of the apostles at that period, as heaven is high above earth. Of course, when he spake those words clear-cut and bold, Peter was not aware of their height and depth. Possibly, he never was, in this world. All truth is revealed progressively, and the highest wonder of Christ's person was reserved for the disciple beloved (who was younger than the disciple who loved) to declare in his extreme old age, probably when his chosen companion had passed beyond this world.

Be that as it may, it is certain that all which has since developed out of Simon's confession, historically, was in it then, as the fruit is in the bud. Otherwise, the Messiah would not have accepted it so readily as the never-failing creed of the future. Nor would He have added, so unreservedly and emphatically—"And upon this rock I will build my church." Simon had confessed neither His atoning, nor mediating work, but solely His personality, and not all of that consciously, and yet because by so doing he disclosed that which was to be the very, or true, rock of His church, Christ pronounced him to be also Peter, a rock. The value of Simon's confession is not to be measured by his understanding of it. It

must be judged by the Lord's reception of it, and by what is embedded in St. John's gospel. This was penned "long after his other writings," and the only key to its mysteries is the truth underlying it—his doctrine of the eternal humanity of "the Word made flesh," or mortal. And, therefore, whilst Peter's confession can never be added to, it may be expanded and elucidated by the unfolding of that doctrine, which lies in it like a kernel in a nut. When the LORD incarnate declared that He would build His church on the living truth then buried in His own words—"the Son of Man," and in Peter's confession—"the Son of the *living* God"—that confession was complete, though still unavoidably dark and unfathomable.

Simon's conviction had not been reached by reasoning. If it had, he would never have confessed. Reasoning would have shown him, as it did the Pharisees and their rulers, who believed not on the Christ, what it involved. Neither, at that time, had he any distinct idea of the incarnation. But he must have had some true feeling of the eternity of the Messiah, even as Man, for he spake by the Holy Ghost. If he had not, he would have been unable to say so honestly and positively to Jesus standing on the ground of His humanity—"Thou" (the Son of Man) "art the Christ," and also, "the Son of the living" or (eternal and life-giving) "God." There was far more in Simon's confession than he was aware of, and therefore whilst the Messiah blessed him, "Satan desired to have him."

There must also have been the breath of a pause in Peter's confession, for it was a climax. It contains two distinct ideas. The last sentence is not a repetition, in other words, of the first. It expresses a wholly new or different idea. It is a rising above the first, occasioned by the fact that the Christ was twofold. As the Jewish Messiah, He was born of the Virgin by the agency of the Holy Ghost; for the angel said to Mary, "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee"—for the purpose of creating Him of her life and substance. And because as "the Son of the living God" He was such by eternal

generation, the angel further said to Mary, "And the Power of the Highest shall overshadow thee"—for the purpose of the Incarnation. The concluding words of the angelic messenger—"Therefore that Holy Thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God"—is a union of those two facts, and of those two announcements. The first proclaimed Jesus to be the created Son of Mary, and hence the Messiah of the Jews, called also "the Son of God," because created by "the Holy Ghost." The second proclaimed Him to be the uncreated Son of God, and hence the LORD of the Gentiles. And therefore He was further called "the Son of the living God," because He was from all eternity "the only begotten of the Father." The angel's words to the Virgin were also, like Simon's words to Christ, a climax. But it was for St. John to cap theirs by teaching, indirectly, that the incarnation of God the Word immortal in Jesus the man mortal, could only have been possible because He (the Word) was, from all eternity, likewise Man *essential*. The essences must be alike—in their quality, human, and in their form, triune, to constitute a true, and therefore a real and lasting incarnation such as Christ's. Of course the incarnation itself is an inscrutable mystery, only to be understood in glory, for then "shall we know, even as we also are known."

It was a rude awakening, therefore, for Peter to have at that juncture (his confession) and for the first time, the sure mortality of Jesus suddenly pressed on him in the words, "the Son of Man must suffer many things, and be rejected of the elders, and of the chief priests, and scribes, and be *killed*, and after three days rise again." Just when rejoicing in the eternity of the Christ, he was called on to anticipate His death! And His death was to be a violent one, for Simon saw no further than the *killing*. The rising again on the third day came not within the scope of his vision. He was overcome by surprise and grief. Hence it was perfectly natural that he should take the Master "and rebuke Him," or, as it really is, "draw Him aside and remonstrate with Him." This, Jesus

admits, when, in addressing him particularly, He speaks vehemently to the tempter back of Simon, "Get thee behind me, Satan: thou art an offence unto me: for thou savorest not the things that be of God, but those that be of men."

SECTION IV.

"And I say also unto thee, that thou art Peter."

In the words, "Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jona, for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven," the Master was quick to recognize the source and author of Simon's conviction. And, in the words, "And I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter," He made haste to acknowledge that the same life eternal was in him which was in Himself. No man, at that time, could have said that Jesus was the LORD, or Jehovah, but by the Holy Ghost. Therefore Peter, speaking thus, showed himself to be begotten of God, or, which is the same thing, regenerated by the Spirit. Hence the Messiah immediately pronounced him, too, a son of the living or eternal God: for "Both he that sanctifieth, and they that are sanctified, are all of One, for which cause He is not ashamed to call them brethren."

In the presence of all the disciples, Simon confessed the LORD. Therefore in their presence the Master confirmed to him his name of Peter in its deepest significance. Having declared that whosoever should own Him before men, He would own before His Father in heaven, He now fulfilled that promise as a pledge of the manner in which He will fulfill it hereafter. Then, He will not only acknowledge all true believers and confessors to be His children by name, but prove them to be such on revealing them to be like unto Himself in the glorious "manifestation of the sons of God."

He also gave to this disciple his new name publicly, that he might wear it thus, laying it never aside; and, too, that he might not only be called it by others, but write himself—"PETER, an apostle of Jesus Christ." To James and John

He also gave a new and wonderful surname—"Boanerges, sons of thunder"—but they never wore theirs as did Simon his. Theirs was indicative only of character and qualities. His was declarative of the presence in him of that life by which all Christians, as such, exist. Peter was also called after the LORD's own highest *generic* name to signify that he, for his reward, should be the first (at Pentecost) to offer Christ's twofold life to men, in "the Gift of the Holy Ghost," and thereby bring many sons to God. For though this eternal life of Christ is, in His children, untransmissible as the life of the angels, yet His ministers the Lord permits to be called the spiritual fathers of those whom "in Christ Jesus they have begotten through the gospel."

And, moreover, He gave to Simon alone this surname of Peter, in all its significance, because he alone answered this greatest of all questions—"But whom say ye that I, *the Son of Man*, am?" On that most memorable occasion, twelve men stood before "the King of Israel" and "Teacher sent from God," and He asked them all, "Whom say ye that I am?" Had all answered in chorus, or several simultaneously, or one for all, He would have as gladly responded, Blessed are ye, as "Blessed art thou;" Ye are Petri, as "Thou art Petrus;" Ye are men of the Rock, as "Thou art the man of the Rock;" Ye are sons of the living God, as "Thou art a son of the living God." None spake, save Simon only. And on him fell, unerringly, the honor of being called by that name of "Peter," which, in his wearing of it, the Lord chose should indicate one of the greatest glories of their Master—His ability to communicate, by the Spirit, His twofold life to others.

Simon replied not here for himself and brethren, as when he said, "*We* believe and are sure that thou art the Holy One of God," nor did he now, speaking for himself only, say, "I believe and am sure," as though it was with him merely a matter of belief or conviction. Not at all. As if fully possessed of an unmistakable knowledge, he answered, and said,

"Thou art the Son of the living God." He spake not like the scribes, but like the Master, as one having authority, for he spake by the Holy Ghost, and from His voice there is no appeal. In declaring, "Thou shalt be called Cephas, a Stone," the Master had intimated that Simon would also become, "Peter, a rock." It had been decreed that in order to confess it, he should be the first partaker of the Messiah's twofold life as He is both the everlasting Christ of the Jews and the eternal LORD of the Gentiles; and, therefore, the fulfillment of that decree He now publicly announces in the irrevocable words—"Thou art Peter."

And, finally,—"*Thou art Peter.*" All Christians are *petri* or rocks, through their generation of the incarnate LORD. All are the sons of the living God, because of their participation in His life eternal. But there is only one, who, in the personal name of "Peter," wears the title of "The Rock." No other Christian can be, in this sense, as he is, a *petrus*. Millions of men have crossed the ocean, but none can rank with him who made the first track on the pathless deep. So, countless numbers can repeat St. Peter's confession after him, but he is the only disciple with whom, by God's gracious will, it originated. Hence this life by being first in him, through the revelation of the Father, and confessed first by him, at the prompting of the Spirit, and acknowledged to be first in him, by the confirmation of the Son, makes him what no other of the apostles could be—the very first Rock or Foundation Stone of Christ's church—for *he*, Simon Bar-Jona (henceforward to be known as "Simon Peter"), had "declared His generation!"

"Who shall declare His generation?" Doubtless, Simon the fisherman had often heard those words of Isaiah concerning the Christ read in their synagogues. But who would have thought that by him, as Peter, they were destined to be fulfilled! Of all men, Simon himself did not. And who could have dreamed that a little band of apostles would be the beginning of the Messiah's own regenerating and renew-

ing? But what will the end of it be! Shall the sons of the second Adam be great or small in number? He laid down His life "a ransom for many." Did He take it up again to save but a few? The children of Christ's life shall be "a great multitude which no man can number," for "He shall see of the travail of His soul, and shall be satisfied." A handful will not content Him. Of the sons of the first and sinful Adam, who, by the Spirit, were regenerated of the last and sinless Adam, and who kept their birthright by quenching not the Spirit, St. John says* there will stand before the Lamb representatives "out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation." The whole Christian church is Christ's "high family," and all its true and faithful members are His "noble lineage."

SECTION V.

Neither Confession, nor the Teaching of the Spirit, nor the Messiah's natures human and divine, nor His essences as God and Man, nor Christ Himself, primarily, is "The Very Rock" on which He builds His Church,

"All Christians are Peters (or Rocks) on account of their confession."† And, "Confession is the Rock upon which Peter and all Peters are built,"‡ said Luther.

In trying to discover the true meaning of the sentence—"And upon this rock I will build my church"—and which is one of the most controverted sayings of the Saviour," it is necessary, first, to distinguish between the *visible* church and the *invisible*. The former is built *up* of confessors, and *on* their confession. Otherwise, it would not exist. To bring it into being, and

* Rev. v: 9.

† URIEL: By Joseph A. Seiss, D.D. Note on p. 74. "Alle Christen sind Petri um der Bekenntniss willen."—*Luther*.

‡ *Ibid*: Note on p. 79. "Das Bekenntniss ist der Fels, darauf Petrus und alle Petri gebauet sind."—*Luther*.

"Hence, also, the exhortation even of one of the Popes: "In vera fide persistite, et vitam vestram in petra ecclesie: hoc est, in confessione b. Petri."—*Gregory the Great*.

keep it alive, men must make a sincere and public avowal of their faith in Jesus and their intention to live as Christians. But, after this, the chances are against it, for finite man is also changeable. Something more than a frank and open and truthful acknowledgment of Christ is necessary to keep it steady. It must have, and it has, a sure foundation to rest upon. And this foundation is the *invisible* church. Christ was speaking more particularly of it, than of its superstructure—the visible—when He said, "And upon this *rock* I will build my church."

Consider Peter and his noble confession of Christ. What did the latter avail the disciples who heard it, and perhaps assented, mentally, when the Messiah approved it? And what did it profit Simon himself when, after it, he denied the Lord? Or what support was it to him in his hour of trial? It was torn to pieces by the violence of that tempest. It was burnt to powder in the white heat of that crucible. He was obliged to make another confession to be restored to the church visible, but from the invisible he had not been cut off. It is true, his Christian consciousness had been well nigh slain by the tempter and his devices, but the hidden life within him, the life of "the Christ, the Son of the living God," was revived as soon as "the LORD turned and looked upon him," and Peter, remembering His words of warning, "went out and wept bitterly." Upon no such unsteady foundation as the rock of confession does Christ, the master, build His *invisible* church. If He did, many a martyr would be condemned, who, through the weakness of the flesh, and the fierceness of the trial, has denied his faith when the root of it was yet in him.

Besides, not every one is in a position to confess Christ publicly. Sudden death, seclusion from society, or impassable distance may prevent it; and yet he is saved who under such circumstances confesses alone to his Maker, and puts his trust in Jesus. The Lord incarnate builds His church invisible on something surer and more attainable than a profession of faith

in Him, whether open, or private. No one could have made a better public confession of His person than Simon Bar-Jona did. It was earnest, sincere, and enlightened; so much so, that the Master accepted it as the creed of His church universal, and that forever. But if Peter could then have added to it an acknowledgment of Christ's work as a Saviour, and of himself as a sinner thoroughly lost, it would not have made him a member of His invisible church. He was already a member of that. And therefore for both these reasons—membership of the one, and confession to the other—the Messiah pronounced him His son.

Another writer declares that by "this rock," or "this foundation," is meant "God's work of revealing to His elect people the mystery of the incarnation."* But that mystery was made known to Simon Bar-Jona, and, as the Messiah assured him, by the Father Himself; and yet the revelation was entirely forgotten by Peter when the shadow of Christ's cross loomed up black and dreadful before him. God's work of revealing can also be resisted and denied. St. Paul was striving against his convictions that Jesus was God and the true Messiah, when Jesus called to him, "it is hard for thee to kick against the pricks," and he responded, "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" And a prophet can refuse to obey the command of God. The LORD ordered Jonah to go and cry against Nineveh, but Jonah fled to Tarshish, because unwilling to do God's work. Simon Peter, on the contrary, obeyed the voice of God in his soul, and was blessed because he spake frankly and fearlessly his honest conviction. Moreover, even when a man speaks by the Spirit, it is not always evidence that he is born again. Balaam and Caiaphas, each, prophesied truthfully, but neither was a servant of God. The Spirit spake through, and in spite of them; but when He spake by Peter, he spake with Him, concurrently.

But whilst neither Simon's conviction nor confession of

*"Jesus and The Coming Glory: or, Notes on Scripture." Page 158.—*Jos. Jones, L.L.D.*

Christ's twofold Sonship, suddenly made him a member of His church invisible (and to which Jesus was referring), it did disclose that he was one of God's "elect people." Therefore, in the words, "And thou art Peter," or, "Thou, too, art a rock," the Messiah virtually gave him the right hand of fellowship, and thus, formally, made him a member of the one church because he was already a member of the other. Not the readiness and fervor of his words, nor the cherished teaching of the Spirit, made Simon Bar-Jona, "Petros," a Christian. They were the result of his being such, and served to reveal it; and, therefore, in further adding—"And upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it"—the Master also promised to establish him upon this living rock firmly and forever. And this promise He was strictly fulfilling when He suffered Simon to be tempted, and to deny Him, and then, in his greatest extremity, restored him with a look—that look in which beamed the whole soul of the LORD, as with it He revived within him the Christian consciousness which had been overlaid and well-nigh smothered by fear.

If that other and greater work (regeneration) had not been wrought in Simon Bar-Jona, if he had not been born again, of God, and made a partaker of eternal life through Jesus Christ the LORD, he would never have confessed what he did. Nor, having denied Him, would he have ever been lifted out of that gulf of despair into which he had been plunged by the devil. Naught but that Divine and unconquerable life, restored in Peter, brought him again from the dead, and compelled him to cry, "LORD, thou knowest all things," whilst the corresponding life in the Master made Him rejoin, "Feed my sheep." And yet not even "the washing of regeneration" is enough to save a man. That is only the beginning of his Christian life, and an instantaneous act. After that, he needs daily, and to the end of his life, "the renewing of the Holy Ghost" for his sure salvation.

Still another declaration is that "this rock" on which the

Redeemer builds His church is "the natures, human and divine, which Peter confessed were united in Jesus Christ as He is man and God." But as the natures would be nothing without the essences accompanying, another instinctively advances by declaring that Christ's church is built on Christ Himself as He is believed and confessed to be both God and Man.* This is indeed true of Christ's visible church, one of whose articles of faith is that He is both God and man, but it will not apply to its foundation—the invisible. That is built upon something very different. It must be borne in mind that in the words, "And upon this rock I will build my church," the LORD incarnate is speaking as much, if not more, of the building of each church, as of the foundation of each. Hence, in so doing, He only incidentally reveals the rock which is to be the latter's last support. That Rock was not to be actually uncovered till the Day of Pentecost, and then by Peter himself to the whole world, in the words—"the Gift of the Holy Ghost."

Not upon His life as specially created man, dare it be said that Christ builds His church invisible, even though this life is also in a lower sense (than His incarnate life) divine, because created by the Holy Ghost. This only made Him the everlasting Messiah of the Jews, not the eternal LORD of the Gentiles. It made Him merely "the Stone of Israel," upon which was built His "Father's House," or church. But that church went down, and the Messiah with it, because of the mortality of His life there, and His character and office of a Saviour.

*Dr. Wordsworth thus paraphrases the words of the Saviour: "'I myself, now confessed by thee to be God and Man, am the Rock of the Church. This is the foundation on which it is built.' And because St. Peter had confessed Him as such, He says to St. Peter, 'Thou hast confessed Me, and I will now confess thee; thou hast owned Me, I will now own thee; thou art Peter; i. e., thou art a lively stone, hewn out of, and built upon Me, the living Rock. Thou art a genuine *Petrus* of Me, the divine *Petra*. And whosoever would be a lively stone, a *Peter*, must imitate thee in this thy true confession of Me the living Rock; for upon this Rock, that is, on *Myself*, believed and confessed to be both God and Man, I will build My Church.'—Lange's Com. Note on page 297.

That created life, too, will never appear in Him again, personally, except in His human form of body, which was the expression of it. Nor will it appear in any other way in His people. For, at their resurrection, their bodies shall be animated with His *immortal* human life, of which, up to that period, they had only been the heirs, but shall then become the actual inheritors of. Only in partaking of Christ's sinless mortal life at the desire of the Father, is the visible Christian church built upon, and so made to be a continuation of the Jewish. In every other respect, the invisible part of it was to have, and it has, a life and individuality or self-consciousness entirely its own. Its foundation was to be, and is, deeper and stronger than the Jewish. Yea, it is one which, even here, reaches into heaven, because it comes from thence and returns thence.

So then Christ's church *invisible* is not the outcome of the Jewish, nor built upon it. Neither is it built on His natures human and divine, nor on His essences human and divine. Much less then is it built on Peter as the confessor of Christ; and still less on Peter himself.* Nor is it built on Christ Himself, not only as He is "*believed and confessed* to be both God and Man," but as He really *is* both God and Man.

Besides, before it could be granted that the church *invisible* is built upon Him as He is "both God and Man," the *quality* of Christ's humanity would have to be determined. His divinity is acknowledged to be eternal. Is His humanity also eternal? This question now demands study and settlement,

*"Augustine at first referred the *petra* to the person of Peter. He says in his *Retractions*, i. cap. 21, at the close of his life: "I have somewhere said of St. Peter that the church is built upon him as rock. . . . But I have since frequently said that the word of the Lord: 'Thou art *Petrus*, and on this *petra* I will build my church,' must be understood of Him, whom Peter confessed as the Son of the living God; and Peter, so named after this rock, represents the person of the church, which is founded on this rock and has received the keys of the kingdom of heaven. For it was not said to him: 'Thou art a rock' (*petra*), but, 'Thou art Peter' (*Petrus*); and the rock was Christ, through confession of whom Simon received the name of Peter. Yet the reader may decide which of the two interpretations is the more probable."—*Lange's Com. Note on page 296.*

for the shoulders must be equally strong that uphold His invisible and ever-enduring church.

As what "Son of Man," then, did Jesus possess, and claim, and exercise undeputed and inherent "power on earth to forgive sins," that power, which, the scribes said truly, belonged to God alone? Surely not as the created Son of man, as the Jews understood Him to mean! No wonder that they, hearing those words, "Thy sins are forgiven thee," and witnessing that miracle of confirmation, "Rise up and walk," "reasoned in their hearts:" "Why doth this *man* thus speak blasphemies? Who can forgive sins but God only?"

The question then is, As *what* Son of man did the Messiah say of Himself to the Jews (and to their amazement): "No *man* hath ascended up to Heaven but He *that came down from heaven, even the Son of Man which is in heaven?*"* Christ was not, as Jesus the mortal Son of man, in heaven then, nor did He, as *such*, come down from heaven. Therefore to say, with some, that He was predicating this being in heaven, then, of His Divine nature *only*, is to separate His humanity and Divinity, which may never be done. Or, to say with others, that the created humanity of Christ was so one with the (uncreated) Divinity, that, by the force of that oneness, He was even then in heaven as our mortal Son of man, is to confound or mix together His humanity and Divinity, which also may never be done.

"What and if ye shall see *the Son of Man ascend up where He was before?*"† the Messiah asked. Before what? Evidently, before His coming down into the world, or previous to the incarnation. But Jesus, the created and mortal Son of man, was not in existence before the incarnation. What Son of Man, then, was in existence before that event, and came down from heaven at that period? "*Who is this Son of Man?*" was the puzzled question of the Jews; and, "*Whom say ye that I the Son of Man am?*" was the all-important query Jesus put to His disciples. Christ could not speak

* St. John iii. 13.

† St. John vi. 62.

more plainly to the Jews at that time and say this Son of Man is the same as the Son of God eternal. He could only adhere to His words—"What and if ye shall see the Son of Man ascend up where He was before?"

Now, however, since all is revealed, the question, "Who is this Son of man?" may be asked; and the answer made—Not Jesus born of our humanity. *He* had no existence prior to the moment of His conception by the Holy Ghost; and in the divine ordering of our salvation could not ascend to heaven till He had become *immortal*. He was the time-created Son of the Virgin, and her true Son, too, bone of her bone, and flesh of her flesh; for the angel said to her: "Hail, Mary, *thou* art highly favored" . . . "behold *thou* shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a Son, and shalt call His name Jesus."* This name signified His office, and so here meant the promised Saviour; for the angel said to Joseph, "He shall save His people from their sins."† But because this conception was to be brought about by the Holy Ghost coming upon her, Jesus, that Holy Thing which should *be born of her*, was not to be called *her* Son, but, as the angel further said, "the Son of God," which in this place means the specially created Son of God. To have called Him continually "the Son of Mary," might have suggested to a scoffing populace His virgin-birth. Better to let Him be known by them, deridingly, as "the Son of Joseph," the carpenter.

At the Annunciation, the deepest meaning of the succeeding words of the angel—"And the Power of the Highest shall overshadow thee"—could not have been open to Mary, for the fact of the Incarnation was to be gradually unfolded, and proved by Jesus Himself. The knowledge of that might have hindered her in the motherly duty of chiding Him, when twelve years old, for remaining with the doctors of the law in the temple at her husband's and her departure from Jerusalem. And it would most assuredly have prevented her from dictating to Christ at the marriage in Cana of Galilee,

* St. Luke i. 28-35.

† St. Matt. i. 21.

when He was "about thirty years of age," and on the point of beginning His public ministry. That she was the mother of the Messiah so long looked for, who was to save His people from their sins, was happiness enough for her:—"Behold, from henceforth all generations shall call me blessed!"* But she was also to become, gradually, "The Mother of Sorrows," as He was to be "a Man of Sorrows and acquainted with grief."

The words, "where He (the Son of Man) was before," and "came down from heaven," and "is in heaven," spoken by Christ of Himself, whilst yet mortal, could only have been predicated of Him as He was also the eternal and omnipresent Son of Man, or Jehovah incarnate; who was then, is now, and always will be "in the bosom of the Father," as His "only begotten Son," and who alone "hath declared Him." But not even such humanity and divinity, such God and Man—uncreated and eternal—can be proposed as (because it is not) the real rock of Christ's church *invisible*.

Nor, last of all, is "this rock," primarily, Christ Himself. It is true, the Rock in the wilderness, which Moses smote, represented Him. But of what was the water that flowed from that rock, (and followed the children of Israel to keep them from perishing), a real, though faint and shadowy type, under the old dispensation? Did it not hint the communicability of the life of Jehovah, now known, under the new dispensation, as the One Triune God? And yet, even the com-

- * "Blessed, blessed evermore,
With her virgin lips she kissed,
With her arms and to her breast,
She embraced the Babe divine,
The Babe divine the virgin mother.
There lives not on this ring of earth
A mortal who can sing her praise.
Mighty mother, virgin pure,
In the darkness of the night,
For us she bore the heavenly Lord."

Translated by Coleridge from a metrical paraphrase of the Gospels by the German Otfried (A. D. 776-856).

municable power of God's life is not the "very," or identical, rock of Christ's church invisible. What then is?

Nothing less than *the actual and constant communication of that Life* to all true and faithful believers, whether they be ignorant, or cognizant, of this supreme fact that it is really imparted to them.

SECTION VI.

"This Rock."

When the high priest adjured Jesus, "by the living God," to tell them whether He were "the Christ, the Son of God," He answered, "Thou sayest," and "I am." Now to those replies, the Jews would have raised no objection had they understood their prisoner to claim no more than that He was the *created* Son of God, or true Messiah; for they taught that of all created life Jehovah was the author. It was the sense in which He used them (begotten) that evoked their ire. First, He intimated by them that God's life and man's was alike; whereas, whilst man's was communicable, God's, they maintained, was not. Therefore Jesus was a heretic, and not the veritable Christ, as He claimed to be; and so they rejected Him. Second, He declared on oath, that He, who had a beginning; and "whose father and mother they knew,"* was not only the *begotten*, but the *eternally* begotten "Son of the living God." This was blasphemy of the highest kind, and this determined them to put Him to a cruel and shameful death.

The Jews of Messiah's day knew nothing of the incarnation, and still less of God, and of man, as a trinity in unity. They supposed, and held, the life of Jehovah to be like the life of the angels—incommunicable. But Jehovah is neither an angel nor a spirit.† He is man, in essence, or, which is the same thing, His life is triune and communicable. "In the

*St. John vi. 42.

† "God is a Spirit." Rather, "God is Spirit,"—not one among many spirits, but in His nature and essence *Spirit*.—*Com. on N. T., St. John, iv. 24.*

beginning" He revealed it to be such by creating man's life, in those respects, after the pattern of His own—"Let us (Father, Son and Spirit) "make *man* in *our* image, after *our* likeness. So God" (the Triune God) "created man in His own image" (a trinity in unity) "in the image of God created He him." * "For thou hast made him a little lower than the angels," should, according to good authority, be rendered," a little lower than God." †

Those Jews had lost sight of the dignity of man in his original creation. Then he was the reflector, complete and perfect, of God's life, and consequently dominion was given him over all the works of God's hand. But man fell, and the whole natural creation with him. It suited the Jews to shut their eyes to these facts, and ignore Eden and Adam. They chose to trace their descent no farther back than Abraham on the plain of Mamre. "We be Abraham's seed," they said to Christ, and with his blood they imagined they inherited his righteousness. All other men were sinners, but they needed no Saviour. Hence all the many new and advanced doctrines of Jesus were offensive to them; whilst His proffers of life, "everlasting" and "eternal," were madness and blasphemy. They knew that the angels were not a race, but each a separate and independent creation. In that respect they deemed their life superior to man's, and a copy of Jehovah's. But "unto which of the angels said He at any time," "Thou art my *Son*, this day have I *begotten* thee?" Only to the Christ as man could He say it, and not till His resurrection, at which He, through that begetting, returned from the grave immortal. And therefore at this second bringing Him into

* Gen. i. 27.

† "A little lower than the angels." Better, "a little lower than God," *i. e.*, than the Divine nature, with reference to his creation in the image of God (Gen. i. 27).

"Thou sett'st him where is little space,
"Twixt him and powers divine" (*Kable*).

The English Version is taken from the Greek, which is followed in Heb. ii. 9; but the original word, *Elohim*, never occurs in the sense of "angels."—*Com. on O. T., Psalm viii. 5.*

the world, the Father also said, as at the first (the incarnation), "Let all the angels of God worship Him;" because He was, what they are not, man made in the image of God.

Man is an advance on the angels. They are: the representatives of God's unity and His life as it was, under the old dispensation, incommunicable. But man is the representative of His trinity, and His life as it is, under the new dispensation, communicable. Only after the resurrection, will Christians be "as the angels of God who neither marry nor are given in marriage." But then they will further be what the angels never can be—the representatives of God's trinity in unity, and so, complete in Him, and in themselves as His images.

Three grand charges against the Messiah were really hidden under that one accusation of the Jews—"He made Himself the Son of God." All of them were condemnable heresies, and each called for death. They were not presented to Pilate, because they came not within his province, and they had already been determined by the church as represented by the council of the Sanhedrin and the high priest.

These charges were, first, That the life of Jehovah was communicable. Second, That it had been communicated to Himself. And third, That it was in His power to communicate it, by the Spirit, to others. And these three, now established as cardinal doctrines of the Christian Church, Christ and Peter, each, really did confess. The Messiah did so, plainly, in His preaching, and incidentally at his trial. And Peter did so for the first time, and indirectly, when to the question of Jesus: "But whom say ye that I (the Son of Man) am?" he answered, "Thou (as such) art the Son of the living God."

There is equal virtue in Peter's use of the word "Son," here, and the word "living." As Christ apprehended and accepted them, the former, "Son," means Son *generative*, as well as generated. And the latter, "living," means life-giving God. "Thou hast the words of eternal life," was the great attraction to St. Peter, when "many of His disciples," offended at the doctrine Jesus presented in the synagogue at Capernaum,

"went back and walked no more with Him" And though at that time Peter and his brethren may have meant by "the words of eternal life," no more than the *promise* of such life hereafter, and thus occasioned little joy in the heart of their Master, yet those words, more than His miracles, induced them to adhere to Jesus and believe in Him as the true Messiah.

This peculiar significance of St. Peter's answer,—the life-giving Son of the life-giving God,—made Jesus exclaim so rapturously: "Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jona: for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven." That significance caused Him to say, as it may be paraphrased—This "living," or eternal human life, which, in my Father, is communicable to me, His Son, and which in me is generative, and now incarnate in order to be given to man—This "living" or "eternal life" as it is inseparably united to my created human life as sinless man, "the Holy One of God," and which, with it, is by the Spirit conveyed to all believers who abide in me—This life actually and unceasingly communicated to them in this world,* is the very, the true, the unfailing rock upon which I will build my church universal and invisible: and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."

What, indeed, would it have availed man that his life was created in the image of God's life, human, triune and indestructible, had God's been incommunicable? Sinless, man could never have become immortal, and sinful, he could never have been redeemed. But being, whether sinless or sinful, alive forever, all his happiness depends on the fact that God's life is, in power, as communicable as his own. But what would even this avail man, were it not, further, by him *attainable*? For after all, its *actual communication* rests with the will of God. Of this He has not left man in doubt nor ignorance—"God our Saviour will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the

* "These things have I written unto you" . . . "that ye may know that ye have eternal life." I John v. 13.

truth."* "And the Spirit and the Bride say, Come. And let him that heareth say, Come. And let him that is athirst come. And whosoever will, let him take of the water of life freely."†

But men are free agents, though enslaved by sin, and can refuse to go to God; and He will not force them to accept salvation. They can even, as St. Paul with exquisite irony told his countrymen, "judge themselves unworthy of eternal life." "Ye will not come unto me that ye might have life," said Christ to the Jews. But this aside. That "water of life" is the only real support of Christ's Church invisible. To it, it is constantly communicated by the Spirit. It is the life of Jehovah. And it flows alone by His will; for "the children of God" are "born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God."‡

And yet still further back than this reaches the salvation of man. God's will is prompted by His love. Love caused Him to open this "pure river of the water of life," and invite all men, "whosoever," to partake of it. "For God so *loved* the world, that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life." Love moved Him to create man; and when he had fallen, love moved Him to redeem him. And therefore St. John writes, as if it was His very essence and being—"God is LOVE."

* I Tim. ii. 3, 4.

† Rev. xxii. 17.

‡ St. John i. 13.

VIII.

NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

IMPARTIAL INVESTIGATION INTO THE REASONABLENESS OF THE DOCTRINES OF CHRISTIANITY. By Prof. E. Schultz. Pp. 264. Philadelphia: Lutheran Publication Society.

This book is divided into eleven chapters with the following headings: The Question—What about God—The Story of the Fall of Man—What is Salvation—Christ the God-Man—Christ the Logos—Christ the Sacrifice—Christ's Continual Presence—Spiritual Existences—Prophecies and their Interpretation—The Higher Criticism.

These topics are discussed in a manner which indicates wide reading and no ordinary degree of ability for philosophical thinking. The author's method is to bring the leading doctrines of Christianity into comparison with the teaching of the latest science and philosophy, and to show that there is no irreconcilable contradiction between them. Herbert Spencer's doctrine of evolution, it is maintained, if consistently interpreted, does not contradict the fundamental doctrines of Christianity, understood in their Biblical sense. This statement may evoke an incredulous smile from some readers; and the writer himself is free to confess that from some of the positions assumed in the book he dissents; nevertheless, a careful perusal of its pages will show that the discrepancy is not as wide as usually believed.

The author's position is not that the Bible teaches just the same doctrines that are taught by modern science. He holds, on the contrary, that the Bible teaches no science at all. "The Bible is written and inspired for the sole purpose of saving mankind from sin and its consequences, and to open up and show them the way how to come to God, or, as Christ expresses it, how to enter into His kingdom. Whatever does not bear on this subject is not a subject for inspiration, and is alien from the object of the Bible." No labor, accordingly, is wasted in trying to prove, for example, that the word *yom*, in the first chapter of Genesis, means an indefinite period of time, and that the six days of creation are intended to denote geological eras, after the manner of the ordinary modern harmonist. To this principle, however, the author is, in our opinion, not always faithful. Thus, for example, he treats the history

of the fall, in the third chapter of Genesis, not as a *myth* in which a primitive age expressed its idea of the origin of evil, but as an *allegory*, the object of which is to describe the beginning of sin quite in the sense of the modern evolutionist. In this connection we would express our dissent also from the theory advanced in regard to the natural condition of the human will. That Luther's doctrine concerning the total moral inability of the natural man, advanced in his tract *De Servo Arbitrio*, can easily enough be harmonized with the modern doctrine of evolution, we are quite ready to admit; but that this is the doctrine of the Bible on the subject we do not believe.

On the subjects of Christology and Soteriology the author is in accord with the general tendency of the "new theology." Anselm's treatment of the atonement, which the author believes rightly to involve tritheism, is given up; and the death of Christ is said to be "a sacrifice by means of which God's infinite love becomes a possession of man." The object of the death of Christ is not to change God's disposition towards man, which is always that of love, but "to bring man to repentance."

In order to show the author's style and indicate some of his leading philosophical principles, we quote the following sentences concerning the origin of human personality: "Immaterial force, invisible power, is the ultimate of all things. This force is the equivalent and carrier of sensation, feeling, consciousness, in a dispersed, impersonified manner. The personification of this consciousness, so as to become self-consciousness, a knowing and feeling human intelligence, takes place by means of the union and harmonious co operation of many forces in one orderly and intimately united whole, so that each part partakes of the sensation of every other part." The divine personality is accounted for in the following manner: "All nature is one intimately united and connected whole, according to certain, definite and invariable laws. . . . There is, therefore, an indissoluble sympathy and conscious connection between every part of nature, which in man becomes self-consciousness, and which in the central unit of all power, God, must of necessity also be a personal consciousness; for it unites all feeling, all knowledge and all consciousness in itself."

Without offering any comments on the above, which the reader can make for himself, we quote but one more sentence, in which the general basis of prophecy is indicated: "If human knowledge, personality and self-consciousness is the result of a special organization within that general consciousness whose centre, source and life is God, must it not necessarily follow that the knowledge and the act of God must become the knowledge and act of man, as soon as his personal powers are sufficiently harmonized and perfected in themselves, to respond to the influence of that central consciousness whence they proceed?" According to this, then, the condition of

prophe is inspiration is the perfectly normal condition of all men, and all men are prophets in possibility.

In the last chapter, on the Higher Criticism, the author states that the violent opposition which has manifested itself in so many quarters against this latest theological discipline is simply due to the natural unwillingness on the part of all men to change their minds or habits. The majority of those who cry out the loudest against the Higher Criticism are men who have neither the opportunity nor the ability to know what it is all about. Our denominational Christianity, the author holds, is not favorable to large and liberal theological scholarship. The professors in the theological seminaries are bound by denominational traditions which they must respect on peril of their official life. And so it happens "that from the lands where religious freedom is not the law, the impulse has gone forth to change and enlarge the church doctrines of that country where, from excess of freedom, people are binding themselves down to hard and immovable lines of thought and forms of doctrine."

We believe that many will find this book a profitable study; we say *study*, because the style, which is not always as clear as it might be, as well as the nature of its contents, will make a more rapid perusal unprofitable. It remains only, in conclusion, to say that the preface is dated at Wellersburg, which is a small village in the mountains of Somerset County, Pa., where the author, who is a Lutheran minister, was at the time it was written pastor of a charge. There is a lesson in that, too. Here is a thinker and scholar of the first class immured in an obscure mountain village!

W. R.

MEXICO IN TRANSITION FROM THE POWER OF POLITICAL ROMANISM TO CIVIL AND RELIGIOUS LIBERTY. By William Butler, D.D. Illustrated. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Cincinnati: Cranston & Curta. 1892. Price, \$2.00.

There is a strong Protestant bias in this work and a large portion of it is occupied in describing the part which the Pope and the Roman Church took to impede and destroy the efforts of the Mexican people to establish and maintain Republican Institutions in their country.

But the author gives a connected and interesting history of Mexico, dwelling mostly upon that history during the period of the efforts to place Maximilian upon the throne. It brings out in vivid colors the leading part which Napoleon III. took in these efforts. It was during our Civil War, when the prospects of the Union were darkest, that Napoleon began to plot against republicanism in Mexico, with the apparent design of counteracting the influence of the U. S. The Empress Eugenie, it would seem, was "the power behind the throne," whilst she, it is said, was under the

influence of her Jesuit confessor. Poor Maximilian and Carlotta were the instruments employed to carry out the design of Napoleon. It is within the memory of many now living, how Carlotta returned alone to Europe to seek aid for her unfortunate husband, and lost her mind under her trouble and disappointment, while Maximilian was tried, condemned and shot.

Juarez was the Mexican patriot who, as the legally appointed president, finally delivered his country from the power of her enemies, to whom Victor Hugo wrote on the 20th of June, 1867: "America has two heroes, Lincoln and thee—Lincoln, by whom slavery has died, and thee, by whom liberty has lived. Mexico has been saved by a principle, by a man. Thou art that man."

When, at the close of our war, the President sent a Corps of the veteran army to the border under Gen. Sheridan, Secretary Seward requested Napoleon to withdraw his forces from Mexico, and the request was promptly obeyed.

What part Pope Pius IX. took in this affair may be gathered in part from the terms in which he addressed Jefferson Davis, as "Illustrious and Honorable President," and in referring to "the rulers of the other peoples of America," the Pope spoke of them as "Lincoln & Co."

The work thus revives recollections of the tragic events connected with our Civil War, whilst it gives a vivid history of Mexico in restoring Juarez to his position and power as the rightful president of that country. The style in which the work is written is excellent, the illustrations are also very good, and altogether the book is worthy of a place in any good library.

INGERSOLL UNDER THE MICROSCOPE. By J. M. Buckley, D.D. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Cincinnati: Cranston & Curtis. 1892.

A tract of 36 pages, purporting to be a reply to some of the attacks of Col. Ingersoll on Christianity. We can hardly think that Col. Ingersoll is worthy of the notice he has received. His attacks are *ad captandum* satire and witticism, without any earnest effort to consider its merits. The mind that can deny common sense to the millions of adherents of Christianity, including the most intelligent and upright of all classes of society, must be lacking itself in some necessary elements of soundness. Of its kind, the tract possesses some interest.

THEOLOGICAL PROPÆDEUTIC. A General Introduction to the Study of Theology, etc., Part I. By Philip Schaff, D.D., LL. D., Professor of Church History in the Union Theological Seminary. Charles Scribner's Sons, 1892.

In his preface the author says of this volume, "It answers the purposes of a map for orientation. Formal Encyclopedia, Methodology and Bibliography are here combined. It is the first original work on *Propædæutic* in America."

Those who as students listened to Dr. Schaff's lectures on Encyclopædia in the Theological Seminary at Mercersburg in former years will be able to form an idea of what is included in this work. The subject is comparatively new in American Theological Seminaries, except so far as it is included in Old and New Testament Introduction. Our space does not allow of any extensive notice in this number of the Review, as we have already included more pages than usually belong to a single number. This remark must apply also to the brief notice we give of the author's seventh volume of Church History.

HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH. By Philip Schaff, D.D., LL.D. Professor of Church History in the Union Theological Seminary. New York, Vol. VII. *Modern Christianity: The Swiss Reformation.* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1892.

Although this is entitled the seventh volume of the author's great work on Church History, the fifth volume is still unpublished, which comprehends the second portion of the Middle Ages. The author says in his preface that "two or three more volumes will be necessary to bring the history down to the present time, according to the original plan." We regret very much that the Modern Period since the Reformation, especially that covering the great struggle in Germany with rationalism and the rise of the great systems of philosophy there cannot be given to the world by Dr. Schaff, but he pathetically remarks at the close of his Preface, "How many works remain unfinished in this world!" The great work of the author's preceptor and colleague, "the father of Modern Church History," Dr. Neander, remained unfinished at his death. Dr. Schaff's work reaches farther than that of Neander, covering, in addition, the Protestant Reformation. We have room only to add now and here that the present volume is fully up, in ability and interest, to the volumes that have preceded it. For our Reformed Church it possesses a peculiar interest in that it gives the history of the Swiss Reformation, conducted largely by Ulrich Zwingli, one of the fathers of the Reformed Church.

A certain sadness gathers around the completion of this volume, as we read in a postscript to the preface the following pathetic words: "The above Preface was ready for the printer, and the book nearly finished, when, on the 15th of July last, I was suddenly interrupted by a stroke of paralysis at Lake Mohonk (where I spent the summer); but, in the good providence of God, my health has been nearly recovered. My experience is recorded in the 103d Psalm of thanksgiving and praise."

None who witnessed it will ever forget the scene presented at the meeting of the Synod in Lancaster, when the great Church Historian, in bodily weakness, with lips trembling with deep emotion, and a glowing heart, delivered what may prove to be his farewell to the

Reformed Church. May he yet enjoy the "Indian Summer" of his useful life, to which he frequently referred in private conversation!

THE PRINCIPLES OF ETHICS. By Borden P. Bowne, Professor of Philosophy in Boston University. New York: Harper & Brothers, Franklin Square. 1892. Price, \$1.75.

This volume, as is indicated by its title, is devoted to the discussion of the fundamental ideas and principles of Ethics. It is a work of decided merit, and deserves the attention of all students of moral science. Among the subjects considered are: the Fundamental Moral Ideas and their Order, the Good, the Need of a Subjective Standard, Subjective Ethics, Development in Morals, Moral Responsibility, Ethics and Religion, Ethics of the Individual, the Ethics of the Family, and the Ethics of Society. The treatment of all these subjects is remarkably clear and acute, and very suggestive. The work throughout is intensely interesting and highly instructive. The leading ideas of the work are that in a working system of ethics the principles of the intuitive and the experience school must be united, and that not abstract virtue but fullness and richness of life is the proper aim of conduct.

CHRISTIAN ETHICS. By Newman Smyth. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1892. Price, \$2.50.

The object of this volume is not like that of Prof. Bowne to discover the true philosophy of virtue, but to bring to adequate interpretation the Christian consciousness of life. The work forms parts of the series known as the "International Theological Library," of which Dr. Driver's "Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament," was the first volume to be issued. Its contents are divided into two parts. The first part treats of the Christian Ideal, and the second of Christian Duties. In the first part are considered the revelation of the Christian ideal, the contents of the Christian ideal, the realization of the moral ideal, forms in which the Christian ideal is to be realized, methods of the progressive realization of the Christian ideal, and the spheres in which the Christian ideal is to be realized; in the second part are discussed the Christian conscience, duties toward self as a moral end, duties toward others as moral ends, the social problem of Christian duties, duties toward God, and the Christian moral motive power. It is scarcely necessary to say that the volume is a truly valuable contribution to ethical science as both the name of the author and the series to which it belongs are a guarantee of this. It is proper, however, to say that it has the merit not only of being rich in thought, but also of presenting thought in a very striking and attractive form. We heartily commend the work to the attention of all our readers.

THE PEOPLE'S BIBLE. Discourses upon Holy Scripture. By Joseph Parker, D.D., Vol. XVII. Hosea-Malachi. New York: Funk & Wagnalls Company. 1892. Price, \$1.50.

This is the concluding volume of Dr. Parker's pastoral notes on the Old Testament. In merit it is fully equal to the volumes that have preceded it. There are two more volumes on the New Testament to follow, and then the series will be completed.

ILLUSTRATIVE NOTES. A Guide to the Study of the Sunday-school Lessons for 1893, including Original and Selected Expositions, Plans of Instruction, Illustrative Anecdotes, Practical Applications, Archaeological Notes, Pictures, Diagrams. By Jesse L. Hurlbut, L.D., and Robert R. Doherty, Ph.D. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Cincinnati: Cranston & Curtis. 1892. Price, \$1.25.

This is one of the very best of the various volumes published for the use of Sunday-school teachers. Any teacher possessing these Notes and studying them carefully will be well informed with reference to the lessons for the present year and abundantly supplied with material to impart interesting and profitable instruction. There ought to be a large demand for the work.

QUEST AND VISION. Essays in Life and Literature. By W. J. Dawson, author of the Church of To-morrow. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Cincinnati: Cranston & Curtis. 1892. Price, 90 cents.

This is an interesting and instructive volume of essays. The subjects treated of are Shelley, Wordsworth and his Message, Religious Doubts and Modern Poetry, Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, George Eliot, George Meredith, and the Poetry of Despair. The essays are all possessed of a high order of merit and will be found very entertaining reading.

THE BISHOP'S CONVERSION. By Ellen Blackman Maxwell. With an Introduction by James M. Thoburn, Missionary Bishop for India, and Malaysia. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Cincinnati: Cranston & Curtis. 1892. Price, \$1.50.

The object of this story is to give a true account of the nature of missionary work and to correct misapprehensions concerning it. The author, Mrs. Maxwell, speaks from experience, having seen much and served well in the missionary field. Many of the incidents used in the course of her story are, it is said, recitals of actual occurrences and by no means the creation of the imagination alone. The book is not only entertaining but also gives much useful information. It ought to have a place in every Sunday-school library.

THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES. By the Rev. G. T. Stokes, D.D., Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Dublin and Vicar of All Saints, Blackrock. Vol. II. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 51 East Tenth Street. 1892. Price, \$1.50.

In this volume Professor Stokes completes his admirable exposi-

tion of the Acts of the Apostles for "The Expositor's Bible." Those who have the first volume will of course want this volume also. Those who have neither should purchase both, as the work is possessed of superior merit, and will prove a valuable addition to any library. Ministers, especially, will find it very suggestive. To Sunday school teachers it will be of great service in the study of the International Sunday-school Lessons for the third quarter of the present year.

FROM THE PULPIT TO THE PALM BRANCH. A Memorial of C. H. Spurgeon. Sequel to the Sketch of his Life entitled, "From the Usher's Desk to the Tabernacle Pulpit." Five Memorial Sermons by Rev. A. T. Pierson, D.D. Descriptive Accounts of Mr. Spurgeon's Long Illness and Partial Recovery; His Last Month at Mentone, including Verbatim Reports of the Last Two Addresses given by him and the Last Two Articles He wrote. With the Official Report of the Services in Connection with his Funeral. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 51 East Tenth Street. 1892. Price, \$1.25.

This work is fully described by the contents of its title-page. It is an interesting volume, and will be especially welcomed by the many admirers of the great preacher who lately passed from among us. It is a fitting tribute to his memory.

THE STORY OF JOHN G. PATON. Told for Young Folks; or Thirty Years among South Sea Cannibals. By the Rev. James Paton, B.A. With Forty-five full-page Illustrations by James Finnemore. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 51 East Tenth Street. 1892. Price, \$1.50.

This book gives an exceedingly interesting account of missionary labor, and presents conclusive proof that the gospel of Christ is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth. It is a book which should find a place in every Sunday-school library, and be generally read by the young and the old. The story is one of true heroism, and can scarcely fail to promote heroic action.